

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY

Vol. 2

SPRING, 1961

No. 5

CONTENTS

FOREWORD - - - - The Very Rev. John Coventry, S.J. 162

Articles

- THE CHURCH: THE ONE BRIDE OF
CHRIST - - - - Clarence Gallagher, S.J. - 163
- SALVATION 'OUTSIDE' THE CHURCH - Laurence Cantwell, S.J. - 169
- PRAYING FOR CHURCH UNITY - - Michael O'Halloran, S.J. 174
- THE CHURCH VISIBLE IN MÖHLER - Peter Hebblethwaite, S.J. 177
- THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES Anthony Lawn, S.J. - 183

Notes and Comments

- A PLAIN ACCOUNT OF THE PEOPLE
CALLED METHODISTS - - - Joseph Raybould, S.J. - 189
- THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH - Manus Keane, S.J. - 192
- BANTU PHILOSOPHY: A FIELD FOR
ADAPTATION? - - - Henry Wardale, S.J. - 194
- SYSTEMATIC LUTHERANISM: PAUL
TILlich - - - Leopold Leblique, S.J. - 197

Reviews

- Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Francis Clark, S.J.); 199
- City of Wrong: a Friday in Jerusalem* (M. Kamel Hussein); *An American Dialogue* (R. McAfee Brown and Gustave Weigel, S.J.);
- Christendom* (Einar Molland).

BELLARMINE COMMENTARY is produced twice yearly, for private circulation only, by the theologian scholastics of Heythrop College. All communications should be addressed to: The Editor, Bellarmine Commentary, Heythrop College, Chipping Norton, Oxon, England.

FOREWORD

In June, 1959, in the first Encyclical of his reign, the Holy Father appealed warmly and earnestly for unity among separated fellow Christians, and he begged priests and seminarists to devote care to studying this question, and all the faithful to pray constantly for union. In the same month Father General constituted a new Section of the Apostleship of Prayer which was to be devoted to praying for union; and in a letter to Major Superiors in September, 1960, he urged them to press ahead with a campaign of prayer for unity. 'We must pray with fervour, with persistence, with trust, that the Divine Goodness may be pleased to shorten the time of this sad separation between sons of the same God and brothers of the same Christ'.

We must pray, because only God can fashion this union. Man cannot do it; and we may find ourselves uneasy about the discussions that take place between the churches, in case it should be suggested that it is up to us to forge the unity of the Church, in committee as it were. Surely, God has already *made* the unity of the Church—by the Incarnation and its expansion into the Body of Christ—and it cannot be in the power of man to break it? 'I shall be with you all days . . . ' So, from that point of view it would appear that the Church has never been disunited.

And yet, from the Acts of the Apostles and St Paul's Epistles onwards, has it ever been perfectly united? Indeed, is not the unity of the Church in Christ something that is achieved in Heaven, not on earth? And are we, therefore, not making a mistake, if we have some narrow and monolithic conception of the unity the Church can attain on earth? These, it seems, are questions for the theologians to answer.

John Coventry, S.J.
Provincial.

THE CHURCH: THE ONE BRIDE OF CHRIST

CLARENCE GALLAGHER, S.J.

ACCIPE annulum, fidei scilicet signaculum; quatenus sponsam Dei, sanctam videlicet Ecclesiam, intemerata fide ornatus, illibate custodias'. With these words the episcopal ring is placed on the finger of the newly consecrated bishop, as a token of the mystical marriage between Christ and his Church: a theme which constantly recurs in the liturgy and in the writings of the Fathers. The imagery was used by Christ himself, and developed by the Apostles, but its roots extend back through the whole tradition of the Covenant between Yahweh and his people. What is the origin of this theme?

The keynote of Mosaic religion is the Alliance: the Covenant struck between God and his people when he delivered them from the oppression of Egypt. 'I am the Lord who will bring you out from the work-prison of the Egyptians, and I will deliver you from bondage . . . I will take you to myself for my people, I will be your God' (Ex 6.6-7). This Covenant was ratified in the wastes of the Sinai desert when from the midst of the fire God spoke to Moses 'face to face' (Deut 5.4). 'If therefore you will hear my voice and keep my covenant, you shall be my peculiar possession above all people: for all the earth is mine. And you shall be to me a priestly kingdom, and a holy nation' (Ex 19.5-6). The resemblance between this alliance and the marriage bond is close, and even now the Lord is declared 'a jealous God' (Deut 5.9).

The first to make use of the marriage contract to describe the alliance was the prophet Osee, and by doing so he originated an enduring tradition. His writing takes us back to the third quarter of the eighth century. For him the knowledge of God is not something abstract; it implies personal intimacy, and he describes the relationship between Yahweh and his people as the story of the all-enduring love of God for them though they played the wanton. The history of the prophet's own marriage supplied the pattern. His wife, Gomer, had proved unfaithful; she was an adulteress. Yet Osee sincerely loved her, and suffered deeply because of her repeated infidelity; the torture of his own heart cast a new revealing light on the greatness of Yahweh's love, and the relationship between Yahweh and his beloved people was now portrayed through the symbolism of the marriage bond: 'And I will espouse thee to me for ever: and I will espouse thee to me in justice, and judgment, and in mercy, and in commiserations. And I will espouse thee to me in faith' (Os 2.19-20). In spite of all her unfaithfulness, God will take her back: 'Behold I will allure her, and will lead her into the wilderness; and I will speak to her heart' (Os 2.14). In the light of this generous divine love, the dealings between God and man become transfigured. 'La faute elle-même prend une signification plus profonde et infiniment plus tragique. De simple infraction à la justice, elle devient une infidélité à l'amour' (1). Osee's own patient generosity towards Gomer made him see Yahweh, not as a judge, but as a lover of infinite tenderness, who still keeps himself bound by bonds

of love to his people. Israel's incapacity to attain true spiritual rebirth is stressed; she is the prisoner of past crimes, and does not realise the extent of her iniquity. But in the end Yahweh will take the initiative and will come to her: 'I will heal their breaches, I will love them freely; for my wrath is turned away from them' (Os 14.5).

Yahweh's espousals are not mentioned in the early chapters of Isaias, but we meet the theme again about a century later in the prophecy of Jeremias, and his treatment is clearly influenced by Osee. Along with other Old Testament writers, Jeremias looked back on the Exodus as a period of glory in his people's history, the initial espousals in the wilderness between Yahweh and Israel. 'I have remembered thee, pitying thy youth, and the love of thy espousals, when thou followedst me in the desert' (Jer 2.2). But Israel had been unfaithful; she had forsaken the fountain of living water and misery had been the result. Surrounded by enemies, and expecting destruction at any moment, the prophet alludes to the terrible affliction of his people: 'Know thou and see that it is an evil and a bitter thing for thee, to have left the Lord thy God . . . on every high hill, and under every green tree thou didst play the harlot' (Jer 2.19-20). Gone from their minds was the abundance of blessings that had been lavished upon them in the desert of old. The Shekinah was no longer the vision that fired their hearts. 'My people hath forgotten me days without number' (Jer 2.32). Yahweh pleads with her to return; shamefully with many lovers she has played the wanton, but now 'Return, O unfaithful children, says the Lord, for I am your husband' (Jer 2.14). All seemed lost; Jerusalem overthrown and the Chosen People carried off into captivity. Yet Jeremias saw that suffering would bring repentance, and hope reappears: 'A voice was heard in the highways, weeping and howling of the children of Israel: because they have made their way wicked, they have forgotten the Lord their God' (Jer 3.21). In his old age the prophet returns to the theme; but now his people are languishing in captivity. He had always been obsessed by their infidelity, but now he sends them words of comfort by the waters of Babylon: 'Let thy voice cease from weeping, and thy eyes from tears', 'I have loved thee with an everlasting love; therefore have I drawn thee, taking pity on thee. And I will build thee again, and thou shalt be built, O virgin of Israel' (Jer 31.16, 3-4). In all their tribulation it is a message of hope. Yahweh has called them back to himself; he has given them the power to repent. A new heart he will create within their breasts, and they will be his people. There is a definitely eschatological note in this chapter, which is quoted by St Paul with reference to the New Alliance in Christ (cf. Heb 8.8-12).

During this same period a more severe message was being delivered by the younger prophet, Ezechiel, who emphasised the heinous guilt of his nation. The trials which were now crushing them were fully deserved. The power and sanctity of Yahweh are dominant in these prophecies, and allusions to the divine love are incidental to the main theme. The marriage alliance is introduced, but only to bring out more

ividly the ingratitude of the Chosen People. He paints a graphic allegorical picture of Israel's early history. Alluding to Sinai, he exclaims: 'And passing by thee, I saw that thou wast trodden underfoot in thy own blood: and I said to thee when thou wast in thy blood: live . . . and behold thy time was the time of lovers: and I spread my garment over thee, and covered thy ignominy. And I swore to thee, and I entered into a covenant with thee, saith the Lord God: and thou becamest mine' (Ez 16.6-8). All to no purpose; before long Israel was off once more a-whoring, and in her harlotry, Yahweh was forgotten. Not even Sodom nor Samaria had sunk so low as poor wanton Judah. And although God would never cast her off completely, greater punishment lay in store for her. 'I will remember my covenant with thee in the days of thy youth: and I will establish with thee an everlasting covenant . . . that thou mayest remember, and be confounded, and mayest no more open thy mouth because of thy confusion' (Ez 16.60-63). 'You shall bear the sins of your idols' (Ez 24.48). These threats were amply fulfilled in 587: Judah was ravaged by Nebuchodonosor, Jerusalem sacked, the Temple of Solomon razed to the ground, and the Chosen People forced into exile from their 'Promised Land' which became a 'desolation without an inhabitant' (Jer 34.22).

Eschatological Development

But this was not to be the end. As Jeremiah had foretold, affliction would bring a change of heart. Her earthly hopes had been shattered, but the faith of Israel remained alive; in her desperate disappointment she sees her dream projected into future realisation. The marriage alliance of Osee now becomes predominantly eschatological. In striking contrast to the harshness of Ezechiel, a beacon of hope blazes up and illuminates the prophecies of the second part of the book of Isaias; and this will characterise the whole of post-exilic literature. The sinful wantonness of Israel has not been forgotten, but the prophet brings comfort and encouragement to the exiles, now paying in full the penalty for their past. Yahweh has not cast them off; no question of a bill of divorce (cf. Is 50.1). The gloom of the exile and captivity is enlightened by the hope of the approaching day of deliverance; the joy of Exodus is to return. A new and more glorious Day of Grace will dawn and Israel can put from her memory the shame of former days. 'For he that made thee shall rule over thee, the Lord of Hosts is his name: and thy Redeemer, the Holy One of Israel, shall be called the God of all the earth. For the Lord hath called thee as a woman forsaken and mourning in spirit, and as a wife cast off from her youth, said thy God. For a small moment have I forsaken thee, but with great mercies will I gather thee. In a moment of indignation have I hid my face a little while from thee, but with everlasting kindness have I had mercy on thee, saith the Lord thy Redeemer' (Is 54.5-8). Such language takes us beyond a mere return from Babylon; it announces the great Day of the Lord, the Messianic era. This, however, receives much more glorious expression in the third part of the prophecies of Isaias (chs 56-66), where eschatology is the principal theme. The New Jerusalem

is depicted in glowing colours. Jew and Gentile are to be united in the glory of Yahweh: 'The Lord shall be unto thee for an everlasting light, and thy God for thy glory'. 'Thou shalt no more be called "forsaken" . . . but thou shalt be called "My pleasure is in her" . . . And the bridegroom shall rejoice over the bride, and they shall rejoice over thee' (Is 60.19-20; 62.4-5).

It was in this atmosphere of hope and expectancy, when Jerusalem was being rebuilt and Babylon but a memory, that the Cantic of Canticles was composed (or edited). So closely bound up is this love-song in ideas and in vocabulary with the prophetic tradition we have been following that its religious significance can hardly be doubted. The allegory (or parable) is in complete harmony with the marriage alliance between Yahweh and the People of God. This becomes clear if we study the Cantic within the living tradition out of which it sprang (Cf. *'Le Cantique des Cantiques'*, by A. Feuillet, 1953). In the Cantic, however, all infidelity is forgotten. There is only one thing of importance, and that is the love, 'strong as death' which binds together Yahweh and his People, his Bride. 'I to my beloved, and my beloved to me' (Cant 6.2). Wanton now no longer, the Bride has been glorified by her Spouse: 'Who is she that cometh forth as the morning rising, fair as the moon, bright as the sun, terrible as an army set in array?' (Cant 6.9). 'Many waters cannot quench charity, neither can the floods drown it' (Cant 8.7). Once more we are envisaging the visionary bliss of the final chapters of the prophecies of Isaias. 'Or tout le Cantique est rempli par la nostalgie du paradis perdu, par des anticipations de plus en plus profondes des jouissances de l'Eden retrouvé et par le désir intense de l'avènement des temps messianiques, où s'instaureront définitivement entre l'époux et l'épouse les relations d'amour les plus chaudes et les plus intimes qui se puissent concevoir' (2).

Fulfilment

With this long tradition, then, in our minds, it is with no surprise that we find the greatest of the prophets using the same imagery with reference to Christ our Lord. St John the Baptist explains to his disciples that he is not the Christ; he is only preparing the way: 'He that hath the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, who standeth and heareth him, rejoiceth with joy because of the bridegroom's voice. This my joy therefore is fulfilled. He must increase, but I must decrease' (Jn 3.29-30). And when our Lord wished to express the unity between himself and those who believed in him, a variety of metaphors came to his mind: he is the Good Shepherd who lays down his life for his sheep; he is the vine and we are its branches; he calls us no longer servants but friends. He went further. His love was deeper than that of friendship, and he turned to the most intimate union that man can know on earth, and used this as a symbol of divine love, recalling and fulfilling the prophecies. 'The kingdom of heaven is likened to a king who made a marriage for his son . . .' (Mt 22.2). The image is repeated in the parable where the kingdom of heaven is

ompared to ten maidens who 'went out to meet the bridegroom' (Mt 5.1). More explicitly still: when it was brought against Jesus that he disciples of John and also the Pharisees observed rigorous fasts, while his own disciples did not, he answered: 'Can the children of the marriage fast as long as the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them, they cannot fast. But the days will come, when the bridegroom shall be taken away from them; and then they shall fast in those days' (Mk 2.19-20). In the light of this symbolism, our Lord's discourse at the Last Supper takes on a new and richer meaning; the love of Yahweh for his People has attained its most perfect expression.

With the coming of Christ the Promises have been transcendently fulfilled. The espousals between Yahweh and his people have at last taken place, and God has pitched his tent among men. Christianity is, of course, a new creation; it far surpasses all previous hopes. The old order has passed away and all has been renewed in Christ. Yet it is the same God who now speaks to us in the person of his Son as has expressed his love through the prophets of old. 'If you be Christ's,' St Paul tells the Galatians, 'then are you the seed of Abraham, heirs according to the promise' (Gal 3.29). It is the Christian community that is the 'true Israel', the chosen race, the consecrated nation; and St Peter here applies to the Christians the words that Moses had heard from God on the mountain (cf I Pet 2.9; Ex 19.5). The kingdom of God had come; the Messianic Day had dawned. Yet complete fulfilment lay still in the future; and as in the post-exilic prophecies, so now we find a new eschatology, with hope focussed upon the Second Coming, the final Parousia. The bridal imagery reappears in St John and in St Paul, but it is now predominantly eschatological.

'Do bear with me,' writes St Paul to the Christians at Corinth, 'for I am jealous of you with the jealousy of God. For I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a chaste bride to Christ' (2 Cor 11.2). A few years later, the Apostle is writing in captivity. As he struggles to express the union between Christ and his Church, a variety of images crowd into his mind, but none of them can convey adequately what he wants to say. Christ is the Head of the Body; he is the keystone of the building; and lastly he returns to the image of the Spouse. Here we have expressed that union of hearts which in so many ways sums up Christ's love for the Church. Now is realised that 'love strong as death' dreamed of in the Canticle. Christ has laid down his life for the Church, and by this redemptive sacrifice he has purified her from all stain. 'Husbands, love your wives, as Christ also loved the Church and delivered himself up for it; that he might sanctify it, cleansing it by the laver of water in the word of life; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish. So also ought men to love their wives as their own bodies. He that loveth his wife, loveth himself. For no man ever hated his own flesh, but nourisheth it and cherisheth it, as also Christ doth the Church, because

we are members of his body' (Eph 5.25-30). This reference to washing is probably an allusion to the ceremonial bath of the fiancée which immediately preceded Greek weddings. Just as the Greek bride had to be ritually purified by the pre-nuptial bath, so the Church is purified in the waters of Baptism, through which the merits of Christ's sacrifice are applied. But there is also a mention of healing waters in the chapter from Ezechiel that I have already referred to, and so we have another link in St Paul with the prophetic tradition. By the sacrament of Baptism, the soul is indeed made holy and purified from every stain of sin. And the Church by the possession of the all-perfect means of sanctification is a holy Church, yet here on earth her members are not all spotless and without stain. Wheat and chaff lie side by side, and all men must daily pray to be forgiven their trespasses. For this reason the passage I have just quoted has frequently been given an eschatological interpretation. The Church will appear in all her glory '*quando Christus apparuerit vita ejus; tunc enim et ipsa cum illo apparebit in gloria; propter quam gloriam dicta est Ecclesia gloriosa*' (3).

This interpretation is confirmed when we turn to St John's use of the bridal imagery. The Apocalypse abounds in allusions to the past history of Israel, and nowhere do we obtain a more complete picture of how Christ has come as the fulfilment of all that had gone before. 'Let us be glad and rejoice and give glory to him; for the marriage of the Lamb is come, and his bride hath prepared herself' (Apoc 19.7-9). The wedding-feast is again the symbol of the final establishment of the kingdom of Christ. St John goes on to show the full realisation of the grandiose dreams of the prophets: the renewed espousals of Jerusalem with Yahweh which pious Jews for centuries had longed for. 'And I John saw the holy city, the new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, prepared as a bride adorned for her husband; and I heard a great voice from the throne saying: "Behold the tabernacle of God with men, and he will dwell with them; and they shall be his people; and God himself with them shall be their God. And God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and death shall be no more, nor mourning nor crying nor sorrow any more, for the former things are passed away." . . . And there came one of the seven angels . . . saying, "Come, and I will show thee the Bride, the wife of the Lamb." And he took me up in spirit to a great and high mountain; and he showed me the holy city of Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, having the glory of God . . . ' (Apoc 21.2-10). The glory of Exodus has returned to the people of God.

St John at the close of his vision saw the gates of the New Jerusalem thrown wide to admit all the nations of the earth, who flock into it bringing their honour and their praise. All that is good in humanity is united to Christ in this heavenly city, the Church. The image of 'bride' that God himself has chosen precludes any kind of division or strife; it implies unity in communion with God. We have tried to look at this Church through the eyes of the inspired authors

of the Bible. We have seen how God prepared the way for its coming. The invitation of the Bridegroom which was first given explicit utterance in Osee, has re-echoed across the centuries. The Canticle's 'Come, my beloved, let us go forth . . .' (Cant 7.11) is taken up once again on the last page of the Bible: 'The Spirit and the Bride say, "Come"'. And the Church on earth has ever made her own the Apostle's eager reply: 'Be it so; Come, Lord Jesus' (Apoc 22.17-20).

References:

- (1) L. Bouyer: 'La Bible et L'Evangile,' p.67.
- (2) A. Feuillet: 'Le Cantique des Cantiques', p.132.
- (3) St Augustine: 'Retractationes' I.18, 14 (CSEL vol. xxxvi).

SALVATION 'OUTSIDE' THE CHURCH

LAURENCE CANTWELL, S.J.

CATHOLIC teaching has always been unequivocal concerning the necessity of belonging to the Church in order to attain salvation. Origen, writing in the first half of the third century, says, 'Jesus had been destined to bring about the fall of many and the rise of many, and therefore his Blood turns to the punishment of those who refuse to acknowledge his sign. Let no one persuade or deceive himself; outside this house, that is, outside the Church no one is saved' (1). This doctrine was founded on the scriptural teaching that there is only one mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ (I Tim 2.5) whose one Body is the Church (Col 1.24). St Cyprian was therefore stating an accepted doctrine with his renowned *Salus extra Ecclesiam non est* (2) however rigidly and imperfectly he may have interpreted it.

On the other hand, the New Testament, following the teaching of the Old, never consigns all pagans to hell. The gentiles Abel, Noah, Melchisedech and Job are acclaimed as righteous men, as patriarchs and Saints (3). The early apologetes were quick to show that the coming of Christ was prepared not merely by the Mosaic law, but also by the philosophy and 'scrupulous religion' (Acts 17.22, Knox Version) of the gentiles. St Clement of Alexandria does not hesitate to call Greek philosophy a testament (diathêkê) given them by God (4) and says that had Christ not preached to the pagans when he descended into hell, it would have been 'no slight injustice' (5).

In our own day the problem has come more urgently before our attention. Improved means of communication remind us daily that the Catholic Church is a minority of the world population, and historical research opens up vistas of world-history beside which the two thousand years of the Church's life seem very short. Anthropology and the study of comparative religions no longer allow us to write off the paganism of the East as primitive superstition and mythology. Further the fruits of justice and true Christian virtue which we see in so many separated Christian communities are not to be reconciled with a rigid ecclesiology which would exclude all non-Catholics from grace and salvation. The Church has in fact never been betrayed into such narrow sectarianism. The theologians of the Counter-reformation showed how

those who were born into heresy and remained in it in good faith were not therefore deprived of salvation (6). In the last century this principle was clearly taught by Pope Pius IX (7) and has been reiterated right into our own day (8).

Nevertheless the force of *Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus* has never been weakened. Pope Pius XII explicitly warned theologians in *Humani Generis* of the danger of turning this into an empty formula (9), and repeated the teaching of *Mystici Corporis* that the Mystical Body of Christ is absolutely to be identified with the Roman Catholic Church. Further, real membership of that Church is attained only by fulfilling three conditions:

Only those are to be accounted really members of the Church who have been regenerated in the waters of baptism, and profess the true faith, and have not cut themselves off from the structure of the Body by their own unhappy act, or been severed from it for very grave crimes by legitimate authority (10).

Such a formula excludes from real membership of the Body of Christ all unbaptised persons, all separated Christians, even though they be in good faith, and, apparently, *excommunicati vitandi*. On the other hand within the scope of the encyclical's words could be included any Catholic in mortal sin, even the sin of formal heresy provided that it was not openly professed. It is outside this visible, juridical Church that there is no salvation. But where traditional teaching has been clear about this doctrine and about the other that not all non-Catholics are deprived of salvation, there has been no such clear teaching as to how the two doctrines are to be reconciled. Nor indeed have the attempted solutions of theologians been unanimous.

From the time of St Robert Bellarmine right down until recent years (11) attempts have been made to solve the dilemma by distinguishing between the Body of the Church (i.e. the juridical structure whose limits are defined by *Mystici Corporis*) and the Soul of the Church (i.e. the company of all those who are in fact in union with Christ through grace). Although many authorities can be cited in defence of this view it receives the favour of few modern theologians. This distinction was rejected by the consultors of the Vatican Council as being 'entirely new in the vocabulary of the Councils' (12). For the term 'Soul of the Church' is most frequently and most authoritatively attributed to the Holy Spirit, and is used in this sense in *Mystici Corporis* (13). Even setting aside this difficulty, it is hard to see how such a distinction differs from the classical Protestant doctrine of Luther and Calvin which has been boldly, if variously, expounded in our own time by Sohlm, Barth, and Brunner (14). The 'Soul of the Church' would logically be the only true Church (*die wirkliche Kirche* of Barth) and the 'body' a merely human organisation, venerable, to be sure, but not in the last analysis more than a *subsidium fidei*. What is more, the biological metaphor seems to be stretched beyond its useful limits when soul and body are in no sense co-terminous.

Father Otto Semmelroth in his excellent book 'Die Kirche als

Ursakrament' proposes another solution. Regarding the Church as a sacramental reality, *the* outward sign of inward grace for the whole of mankind, he sees in the Church a certain relativity, a reference to the life of grace of which it is the effective guarantee and visible reminder. The Church is God's own sign that he wants all men to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth; but being a sign it is not simply to be identified with salvation itself. Nor of course is it merely a sign which has little or no connection with what it signifies 'as when a man ties a knot in his handkerchief and then forgets what it was supposed to remind him of' (15). But God is nevertheless free to make use of this sacramental sign or not, as he wills. Now the formula *Extra Ecclesiam* is only fully applicable where the existence and nature of the Church have been effectively made known to the individual. Where, through ignorance or inborn prejudice, the lineaments of the Church are invisible or distorted, then God is 'free' to bring an individual to salvation outside the visible Church. The economy of salvation requires membership of the visible Church, but this necessity is hypothetical on a man knowing the Church and its claims on him. Where these conditions are not fulfilled we must consign a man to the individual providence of God. To avoid the charge of rendering the Church an unnecessary adjunct, Father Semmelroth shows that even pagans and non-Catholics are saved in some sense by means of the Church. He writes:

'Because Christ continues to live on earth in the Church, this world has become the dwelling of grace. Because in the will of God, the Church is intended for all men, then if they attain grace at all they do so 'through the Church' (16).

Attractive though this theory is, it does not seem to do full justice to the formula *Extra Ecclesiam* nor fully to exploit the funds of doctrine to be found in considering the Church as the sacramental sign *par excellence*. No doubt God can make exceptions to the laws of his own dispensation; no doubt, too, the position of justified non-Catholics is in some sense an exceptional one. But an appeal to the divine freedom is often a disguise for theological agnosticism, an unwillingness to think deeper into a subject and explore the paradoxes which faith presents to us. More to our purpose, if the formula *Extra Ecclesiam* is patient of so many and such far-reaching exceptions has it not been emptied of its real meaning? Is the salvation of non-Catholics an individualist, unecclesiastical salvation? Can one who is in no sense a member of the Church militant become a member of the Church triumphant?

Not all modern theologians propound theories which give rise to these uncomfortable questions. Mgr Journet in his 'Church of the Word Incarnate' applies the traditional doctrine of baptism of desire to membership of the Church. He says that one may belong to the visible Church either visibly or invisibly, and that invisible membership may be either sacramental (as is that of baptised non-Catholics) or spiritual (as is that of pagans) (17). Visible membership is the norm, the reality (cf. the *reapse* of *Mystici Corporis*) to which invisible membership is

referred and by which it is made intelligible. This is not to resurrect the chimera of an invisible Church; there is only one Church, visible, Catholic, Roman. But wherever the Spirit breathes in the world and wherever the soul of man responds to him, a desire is born that can only be perfectly fulfilled within the visible unity of the Church and which already links a man to the whole Body. If this desire, this *votum Ecclesiae* is partially frustrated through inculpable prejudice or ignorance, a man is not thereby excluded from the communion of the faithful. He is invisibly united with them. He lives by the same life as they do although apparently separated from them, as if a branch of the vine were to grow underground and emerge at a distance from the vinestock.

The nature and working of the *votum Ecclesiae* have been very exactly and delicately described by Father Karl Rahner (18). The human race, he reminds us, is one and entire, and just as all men fell in Adam's sin, so all mankind is saved in the obedience of Christ. The human race has become God's people and he claims it as his own. Now the Church is the divinely ordained social and juridical realisation of the people of God. The Church stands to mankind as a legitimate State might stand to a scattered and disorganised people. Where the government has not yet made its presence felt in a land, those who live peaceful and ordered lives are not therefore to be considered rebels simply because they do not obey an authority of which they have not heard. Rather, the State cares for them, wills to protect them, and they for their part must be considered as already in some sense citizens of the State which they would gladly acclaim did they but know of it. The Church is the definitive image of justified humanity, and her image is already inchoatively to be found wherever there is grace among men. Now 'when man as a spiritual person fulfils his own human nature in total self-committal, this personal decision in the concrete is always and inevitably an attitude for or against the supernatural call of man' (19). In living the 'authentic' life (the word is Heidegger's), in making a personal affirmation to the demands of his human nature, in living according to the dictates of conscience, a man necessarily aligns himself with the whole redeemed human race, whose definitive expression is the Catholic Church. It is not to our purpose here to show how such an 'authentic' existence can by the grace of God be truly supernatural; we are here only concerned to show that no salvific act is solitary or individualist, but has always an internal reference to the whole of mankind and, ultimately and implicitly, to the Church.

Extra Ecclesiam nulla salus is the negative formulation of the positive truth that the Catholic Church alone possesses the fullness of grace, 'for where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church and every kind of grace' (20). No other 'church' or organisation or religion or philosophy of life is divinely founded or infallibly guided, nor as such capable of bringing men to life. What goodness and truth there is outside the visible limits of the Church (and let us admit that there is much) has its value in its inner reference to, or its preparation for, the one true Church of

Christ. And those who, with the grace of God and according to the rule of conscience, live within some non-Catholic 'church' or by some way of life will attain salvation not by virtue of that human organisation or philosophy (be it never so noble) but by virtue of the one Body of Christ to which they are unwittingly united.

In the light of this doctrine, then, the mission to the pagans and the ecumenical movement should be seen as part and parcel of the Church's desire for inner unity. The missionary is spurred on by the desire that those outside the visible Church should share to the full the abundant means of grace which are ours. But together with this desire is the urge to make visible the invisible ties which already unite them with us, to break down the walls of ignorance and prejudice which hinder even when they cannot block the communion of grace. 'I have other sheep, that are not of this fold' except by an implicit desire, 'I must call them also . . . so that the world may know that thou hast sent me' (Jn 10.16; 17.23).

Prayer for reunion is not merely a prayer for the salvation of individuals, nor merely for the visible extension of the boundaries of the Church. It is also a prayer for the enrichment of the Church. For when we emphasise the necessity for all men to enter the Catholic Church, we are not denying that the Church itself would become richer for their entry. Who can say what marvellous inner growth the Mystical Body of Christ will enjoy when the special human virtues of all races and all cultures are united in it, and all men have returned to their Father's House, which is, to quote the words of *Mystici Corporis*, no strange one but their very own? (21).

References :

- (1) In Libro Jesu Nave Homilia, 3.5 (PG. 12.841-2).
- (2) Ep. 73.21; cf. 74.7; 4.4.
- (3) e.g. Mt 23.35 Gen 6.8; Gen 14.18; Heb 5.10; Job 1.1, 8. Cf. Les Saints 'Paiens' de l'Ancien Testament, by Jean Daniélou (1956).
- (4) Strom. 6.8 (PG. 9.288).
- (5) Strom. 6.6 (PG. 9.271).
- (6) e.g. De Lugo, Disp. 20, Sect. 4 § 2; Bellarm. De Sacr. Matr. 1.17, ad obj. 9am.
- (7) e.g. *Quanto conficiamur moerore* D. 1677. Cf. D. 1647.
- (8) Letter of S.C. of the Holy Office to the Archbishop of Boston, 8th August 1949. Text given in I.E.R. 80 (1953) 132-135.
- (9) AAS. 42(1950) 571.
- (10) AAS. 35(1943) 202.
- (11) Cf. De la Servière: *Théologie de Bellarmin* (1909) 170-1. *La Vie Spirituelle* 21.2(1932) 70-71.
- (12) Mansi 49.624-5.
- (13) AAS. 35(1943) 219-20.
- (14) Luther: *Ad Librum . . . Ambrosii Catharini*, S.A. 7.710.
Calvin: *Catechismus Ecclesiae genevensis*, 125.
Sohm: *Wesen und Ursprung des Katholizismus*, 11.
Barth: *Die Wirkliche Kirche in Evang. Theol.* 8 (1948) 129-141.
Brunner: *Das Mißverständnis der Kirche*, 11. Cf. 105-9.
- (15) P. 88.
- (16) P. 142.
- (17) P. 34 (English edition).
- (18) *Die Zugehörigkeit zur Kirche*, ZkT. 69(1947) 129-188.

(19) P. 184.

(20) St Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, 3.24.1.

(21) AAS. 35 (1943) 243.

PRAYING FOR CHURCH UNITY

MICHAEL O'HALLORAN, S.J.

DURING the months that have passed since the Holy Father first announced his intention of calling a General Council, Catholics have become more and more aware of their duty of praying for Church unity. Indeed, the Encyclical 'Ad Petri Cathedram' made it clear that this was to be one of the principal ends of the Council: '... It (the Council) will certainly present a remarkable picture of truth, unity and charity—a picture which, we feel sure, those separated from the Apostolic See will examine and accept as an attractive invitation to seek and obtain the unity for which Jesus Christ prayed so earnestly to his heavenly Father' (1). For half a century or so, one of the chief means to this end within the Church has been the Octave of Church Unity, held annually from January 18th, formerly the Feast of the Chair of St Peter, to January 25th, the Feast of the Conversion of St Paul.

The intentions of the various days of the Octave were originally formulated in 1913, and now they have been revised by the Fathers of the Society of the Atonement, under whose aegis so much work for Christian unity is carried on. The following list gives the old and the new versions of these intentions:

	New Version	Old Version
Jan. 18th	The union of all Christians in the one true Faith and in the Church.	The return of all 'other sheep' to the fold of St. Peter, the one true shepherd.
Jan. 19th	The return of separated Eastern Christians to communion with the Holy See.	The return of all Oriental separatists to communion with the Apostolic See.
Jan. 20th	The reconciliation of Anglicans with the Holy See.	The submission of Anglicans to the authority of the Vicar of Christ.
Jan. 21st	The reconciliation of European Protestants with the Holy See.	That the Lutherans and all other Protestants of Continental Europe may return to Holy Church.
Jan. 22nd	That American Christians become one in union with the Chair of Peter.	That Christians in America may become one in communion with the Chair of St Peter.
Jan. 23rd	The restoration of lapsed Catholics to the sacramental life of the Church.	The return to the Sacraments of lapsed Catholics.
Jan. 24th	That the Jewish people come into their inheritance in Jesus Christ.	The conversion of the Jews.
Jan. 25th	The missionary extension of Christ's kingdom throughout the world.	The missionary conquest of the world for Christ.

Clearly, a spirit of delicate charity has been at work in this revision, and the new list of eight intentions justifies itself on that score alone. It has the added merit, however, of laying stress on doctrines, like that

of the Mystical Body of Christ and of the Liturgy in the life of the faithful, which have been given new prominence in recent years. This means that Catholics can pray for the increase and the unity of the Church in terms which fully express her ever-developing life. Corporate prayer for Church Unity has now been formulated in phrases which convey the Faith of the Church in terms fully consonant with her charity, and in a spirit which recalls, for example, the changed references to the Jews in the Holy Week liturgy.

The desire to remove any cause of offence to Jewry in the Good Friday liturgy, and later in the Consecration to the Sacred Heart of Jesus, must have been a welcome sign of real good will to those most deeply affected by it. The Pope himself enlarged on the principles which must have informed these changes in an address to missionaries reported as follows by the *'Osservatore Romano'* on May 11th, 1960:

'At the end of his address, the Holy Father recommended a great understanding towards those of our brethren who, although bearing the name of Christ on their brows and in their hearts, are separated from the Catholic Church. This task must be undertaken with all earnestness; old ways of thinking, pre-conceived ideas and discourteous language must be abandoned, so as to bring about an atmosphere favourable to the return we desire and hope, to help it on and cooperate in every possible way with the work of grace. So to everyone must be unbarred the doors of the unity of the Church of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Thus the missionary apostolate itself will grow and develop in the practice of all Christian virtues'.

No degree of Church unity is likely to be achieved without the authority and the approval of ecclesiastical leaders all over the world; but nothing at all will be achieved, now or at any time, without prayer. The speech of Pope John XXIII which has just been quoted, and the warm gestures from which it stems and to which it will surely lead, should be a cause of great joy to those who are praying for an end to all divisions in the service of God. Encouragement in the faithful, and a corresponding warmth in the hearts of non-Catholics, when translated into petition and praise, can only mean a robust hope in God.

The problem of unity is so vast and the solution still so far from our grasp, that it requires a positive effort to approach God with optimistic gratitude for what has already been achieved. But that effort must be made, and it must be believed in. Any new courtesies, any disregard of prejudice, any sign of understanding between the hitherto estranged, all these things mean a contribution to the building up of the house of God's glory upon earth. Where God is better served because Christians are loving one another better, then the family spirit is re-asserting itself, the family is becoming itself again. It is true that the family is full of quarrels, but a man who is full of hope will set about his prayer for his separated brothers first and foremost because they are his brothers, and not because he is weighed down by the sadness of their separation. There is a great difference between the two prayers: one begins with joy in the Father; the other sets out—and none too cheer-

fully at that—to find it.

The Encyclical 'Ad Petri Cathedram' gives the plan on which prayer for Christian unity could well be based, and its salient points are to be found in the revision of the intentions of the Octave of Church Unity at the head of this article. Time and again in the Encyclical the Holy Father stresses the need for prayer—he prays himself, the faithful are to pray, all our separated brethren must pray. In a section addressed specifically to those who are 'separated from the Holy See', humility, love, and faith are commended as the best means to work and pray for unity. The Pope quotes Theophilus of Alexandria: 'And so, my dearly beloved, who share the heavenly calling, as far as we can, we should imitate Jesus, "the origin and crown of our salvation"'. We should long for a humility which lifts us up on high, for a love which unites us to God, and for a pure faith in the divine mysteries. Avoid disunity, have nothing to do with party spirit. Love one another. Hear what Christ says: "The mark by which all men will know you for my disciples will be the love you bear one another"' (2). Prayer that is humble, loving and full of faith, will make for a life rich in the service of God.

Reflection on the great gift of the Faith is always a source of humility for the Catholic, but it is particularly so when he stops to consider, as he must do in any prayer for Christian unity, that he is the man to whom this immense privilege has been given. Hostility to the Faith, and a still more insidious indifference to it, abound today, but there is also great good in the world, quite outside the context of our own Faith, and even outside that of any faith at all. The workings of divine grace are hidden, yet it would seem that so many people who 'would make splendid Catholics' are never called to visible membership of the Church. Their future state is in the hands of God, but here and now they are a constant reminder of how we ought to be corresponding to the graces that are ours for the asking. If it were possible to let those outside the Church know and appreciate how humble they can make a Catholic feel, perhaps there would be no problem of Church unity at all. Then all Christians would be living the life recommended by St Paul in a passage which is part of the Epistle of the Votive Mass for the Unity of the Church: 'I, therefore, a prisoner for the Lord, beg you to lead a life worthy of the calling to which you have been called, with all lowliness and meekness, with patience, forbearing one another in love, eager to maintain the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace. There is one body and one Spirit, just as you were called to the one hope that belongs to your call, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and father of us all, who is above all, and through all and in all' (Eph 4.1-6).

Humble recognition of the excellence of others can only lead to true love for them, wishing them well as God wishes them well, loving them for his sake, and according to his commandment. The greatest good that can be wished for anyone is the salvation of his soul, and so charity towards those outside the Church must lead to prayer that eventually they will become part of her. As the Catholic prays for those

outside the Church, he may pray for their 'union' in her, their 'return' to her, their 'reconciliation' with her; he will pray that their full life may be restored to those who have cut themselves off from her; that God's first chosen people may share in the full inheritance of the people of God, his holy Church.

Prayer for unity is the expression of our love for others, and as has been pointed out above, it is a plea for a return to that sense of family which the world lost so long ago. St Augustine was quoted by the Holy Father in this sense in 'Ad Petri Cathedram': 'We ask you to observe that our loving appeal to you to enter the unity of the Church is an invitation, not to a stranger's house, but to your own, to our Father's house, which belongs to us all And so all those who are separated from us we address as brothers in St Augustine's words: "Let us love the Lord our God, and let us love his Church. Let us love him as our father, and her as our mother; him as the master, and her as his handmaid, for we are his handmaid's children. But this marriage (between God and the Church) is linked by a bond of great love: one cannot offend one parent and find favour with the other. What use is it not to have offended your Father, if he punishes the offence you have given to your Mother? So, my dearly beloved, I entreat you, with one mind cling to God your Father, and to your Mother, the Church"' (3).

With the humility which makes us realise how worthy others are of the favours which have been granted to us, and the love that makes us wish them well in all things, there comes a great sense of mystery. There is only one Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, but in the world there are many churches, divided in doctrine, but seeking to serve God and to glorify his name. Our Lord has led mankind in prayer, asking the Father that they may all be one, so has not the Church to follow, begging in her turn, that *we*, ourselves and all men, may be one in him?

References :

- (1) AAS. Vol. 51, p. 511.
- (2) Op. Cit. p. 515. Migne (PG 77.1027) attributes the homily from which these words are taken to St Cyril of Alexandria, but this is incorrect. Cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Vol. 3, Westminster, Md., 1960.
- (3) Ibid. Cf. Migne PL 37.1140.

THE CHURCH VISIBLE IN MÖHLER

PETER HEBBLETHWAITE, S.J.

MÖHLER'S view of the Church does not form a monolithic, unyielding block; though he died at the age of 41 in 1838, it had grown and developed. For convenience of exposition, three broad stages can be distinguished. Only a very short time divides his lectures on Canon Law from *Die Einheit in der Kirche* (1), but Möhler's shift of emphasis is very marked: he moves from an external, juridical view of the Church to a view, rare enough at that time, in which the unity of the Church is constituted by the action of the Holy Spirit. But the *Einheit*, which appeared in 1825 was not his last word on the Church,

and in the *Symbolik* (1832) (2) he reacts against the one-sidedly 'spiritualising' tendency of his earlier work and bases his ecclesiology on the Incarnation. Möhler himself is the best critic of his ecclesiology: in other words his theology is always dialectic, constantly rejecting partial formulations, and embodying their truth in a higher synthesis. The three stages I have distinguished form the three parts of this article which concentrates on Möhler's understanding of the visible Church.

It was Geiselman, himself Professor at Tübingen, who called attention to the importance of the lectures on Canon Law and used them as a counter-position to Möhler's later theological thinking (3). There Möhler envisages the Church under the general rubric of a society (like the state), characterised and differentiated by its doctrine, its cult and its organisation. He raises the question in typical *Aufklärung* fashion, by asking whether the Church is a voluntary or a positive society. The state results from some form of social contract and is therefore voluntary; but the Church as the image or, better, the exterior manifestation of the Christian religion, is a positive society of divine origin. If Revelation happened, then there must be a Church, since a Revelation without guarantee, delivered over merely to human reason, would become confused, corrupt and eventually disappear. But why must the Church be visible? Möhler *here* finds this necessity in human nature: 'Identical principles and the seeking after the same ends bring men together by an external bond. To be loved by the same men, to be hated by the same men, produces an external bond' (4). On this view the Church is the exterior call to the interior life. Universality, holiness, truth (and intimately linked with it, infallibility) and unity are deduced—the word is justified in so far as we are dealing with a juridico-philosophic view of the nature of a religious society—as essential traits if the Church is to be the faithful guardian and transmitter of Christianity.

Möhler is here echoing the post-tridentine notion of the Church as *coetus hominum sub regimine legitimorum pastorum*, elaborated, as Père Congar sadly points out (5), as a defensive position against attacks, Gallican and Protestant. Unity is postulated in the Church *ex parte hominis*. But is there not a faint suggestion of semi-rationalism about this position? Just as for the Deist, God, having wound up the great machine of the world, loses interest in it, so, on this view of the Church, God provides the hierarchy and the Church's needs are provided for till the end of time (6). In contrast with this, might there not be a more mystical view of the Church, in which unity is founded *ex parte Dei*?

The mystical view of the Church, already adumbrated by Möhler in the *Theologische Quartalschrift* (7), is developed with a wealth of patristic quotation in the *Einheit*.

Before Pentecost, the activity of the Holy Spirit was intermittent, discontinuous, affecting only chosen individuals; since Pentecost it has been permanent and unbroken, constantly animating and renewing

from within the unity of the faithful (*Einheit* §2). The same Holy Spirit in each of the believers leads them to knowledge and love of the same Christ, and thus forms the divine basis of their union with each other. A new force, a new principle of life is posed in the world. The Holy Spirit, penetrating and vivifying all those who believe, shapes them into a totality (*Gesamtleben*), a spiritual community. Möhler explains in his brief Preface why he did not start with Christ as Redeemer and Teacher; some explanation is called for since the founding of the Kingdom and the inauguration of the New Alliance by Christ at the Last Supper, might seem a more natural and more biblical starting-point for an enquiry into the unity of the Church. Möhler's answer to this question is an appeal to experience: 'The Father sends the Son, and the Son sends the Spirit; thus did God come to us. We reach God the other way round: the Holy Spirit leads us to the Son and the Son leads us to the Father. I wanted to start with what is chronologically prior in our conversion'.

This appeal to concrete experience is typical of the *Einheit*. It is built up on the dialectic contrast between exterior and interior, visible and invisible, letter and spirit. While asserting the whole time the *primacy* of the interior, Möhler is led to admit, sometimes it seems almost grudgingly, that the interior must find some expression or lose its own consistency. This position appears with the utmost clarity in §13 of the *Einheit*: 'Christianity does not consist in expressions or forms of words; it is an inner life and a holy strength, and all teaching concepts and dogmas are valid in as much as they express the inner life which they presuppose. Since a concept is always limited, it cannot express exhaustively ineffable life and must therefore always remain inadequate; for life as such can be neither mediated nor fixed . . .' Such a critique of concepts, of their failure to indicate the complex richness of reality, was not unusual among the German Romantics, who were constantly trying to say the unsayable; it is also echoed among existentialist writers. But Möhler does not therefore bid adieu to language. The passage in §13 concludes: 'But since teaching concepts and dogmas are representations of a particular and determinate inner life, they are not indifferent but rather highly important.' Möhler has subordinated the formulations to the pre-existing consciousness, but he goes on to admit the necessity of formulations; in other words, the exterior is subordinate to the interior, though the inevitability of the exterior is conceded.

These principles Möhler then applies to the Church. He has already posited the unity of the Church by insisting on the Holy Spirit as its constitutive force. Truth cannot be found in isolation, but only in the unity of the faithful. In particular, the Scriptures can only be understood *in sinu ecclesiae*: 'Before the letter was the Spirit; he who has in himself the animating Spirit will understand the expression of the Spirit: the Spirit simply encounters Himself (*der Geist begegnet sich nur selbst wieder*)' (§8). Unity—which supposes charity—and truth are the characteristic notes of the presence and activity of the Holy

Spirit: 'The great thought which is at the heart of all that we have been saying, is that Christianity is not a mere concept, but something which takes hold of the whole man, roots itself in his life, and is only understood in so far as it is lived. Christ is love, and only by love can you draw close to Him (Christus ist die Liebe, liebend also wirst du Christus finden)' (§4). When Möhler criticises the Deist conception of the Church which took as its thinking-model a human institution, society, he is pointing out the inadequacy of the position he had defended himself in the lectures on Canon Law: 'The notion of an institution is inseparable from that of a mechanism; yet the Church is a living organism' (§49).

Here we touch on one of Möhler's most cherished and most fruitful ideas: the Church as a living organism, animated by the Holy Spirit, uniting the body of the faithful, in spite of the divisions of space and time. Nor does he leave this invisible community suspended in mid air, for the exterior is the necessary expression of the interior. 'Si desit eis gratia Spiritus,' says Origen, 'nec membra corporis Christi esse possunt,' and Möhler would develop the axiom still further: if you are filled with the grace of the Holy Spirit, then you will feel the need to belong to the community of the faithful. I will now quote at some length a passage from §49, Unity in the Bishop, because in it we see the transition to the visible unity of the faithful. 'The concept of the Church would be one-sidedly defined if it were called an institution or a society, founded for the maintenance and the spreading of Christian belief; it is rather a product of that belief, an effect in the faithful of the life-giving love of the Holy Spirit. If we try to think of a Christian action, we must always presuppose a Christian attitude of which the act is but the revelation—at least in the conceptual order; for the Christian attitude cannot for one moment remain inactive, it must constantly seek to act on its milieu.

'Let us say then simply this: if the Church were the aforementioned institution, then we would have to assume that Christ had, so to speak *commanded* his followers to come together, without arousing in them an *inner need* to bring them and hold them together . . .

'Just as the divine principle of life participated in by the believers is one, so it forms a unity among those it influences, driving far away all self-love, drawing together all in whom it is present, binding them, forming them into a great social unity, i.e. a Church, whose bond is love precisely because love draws together and unites . . . If then love is given through the divine Spirit, then by that very fact the Church was posed in existence. And it must clearly be visible because of a principle which runs through the whole scale of being and life: the body of a man is a revelation of the spirit in him . . . When powers of a particular kind are found, they pass correspondingly into the visible order. Thus with the entry of divine powers into humanity, with the intervention of this new power, there must appear an outer form (Erscheinung) corresponding to it, as yet unthought of . . .'

I have not the space to follow Möhler through the rest of his argu-

ment; the impulse to unity, planted in the soul by the presence of the Holy Spirit receives immediate visible expression in the person of the Bishop, who is the union of the faithful made plain in a given place, the concretisation of the love of the faithful for each other and for Christ. And once set in motion, the drive towards unity cannot be halted. It leads Bishops to unite with each other and express their unity in the Metropolitan and eventually in the Papacy. 'The whole constitution of the Church is nothing other than embodied love, on the one hand an expression of the striving towards unity of the faithful, and, on the other hand, a means towards this unity, to fix and preserve its strength. The Church itself is the realised reconciliation of men through Christ to God, and therefore it is reconciled in itself and forms a unity in Him. That is the innermost essence of the Catholic Church' (§64).

It is now time to turn to the *Symbolik* to consider how far Möhler abandoned or transformed the view of the Church propounded in the *Einheit*. Developments in contemporary philosophy seem to have influenced to some extent his change of attitude (8). The *Einheit* was worked out in opposition to Deist notions and therefore stressed the divine element in the Church; but his effort in the *Symbolik* is rather to emphasise the human element threatened in the idealistic systems of Schleiermacher and Hegel. In 1825 he brought out the immanence of God in a world the Deists thought abandoned to itself; by 1832 he had realised that the more immediate danger was that of subjecting God to the evolutionary processes of mind, and reasserts accordingly the transcendence of God.

What effect did this awareness of contemporary movements have on Möhler's ecclesiology? Even if we make, as we should (9), a distinction between evolution, which involves reaction and adaptation to external forces, and development of an internal force, Möhler's early view of the Church describes a process which appears both necessary and natural. Now in the *Symbolik* he takes pains to stress man's freedom in accepting the Holy Spirit and also the relative freedom that is sin; he refuses to allow man to be caught up in any 'evolution'—even towards the divine. More important than this simple precision is the central notion which provides the ground plan for the idea of the Church in the *Symbolik*: his ecclesiology becomes Christocentric. In the *Einheit*, the Church, constituted by the Holy Spirit, had only a vague and tenuous relationship to Christ. True, his Person and his work are a condition without which the Church would be unthinkable, and towards them the Church constantly directs her eyes. But it seems as though the redemptive work of Christ and the Church formed by the Holy Spirit were juxtaposed, without any organic link between them. Möhler recognised the dissolving influence of Schleiermacher's Neo-Sabellianism in which Father, Son and Holy Ghost express themselves in their appropriated works of Creation, Redemption and the Church three *moments* in the evolution of the divine. As Möhler saw, this triad of divine works does not take the form of rectilinear development towards increasing perfection, but rather that of a restoration which

takes fallen man and heals him. It is a matter of Redemption, not emerging progress.

Now the central notion in Möhler's view of the Church is that of return, *reditio*, which can be achieved only through the Incarnation of the Word, since man cannot redeem himself by his own efforts. Möhler reacts as strongly as possible against evolutionary tendencies in theology. The *in principio* of St John's Gospel becomes a radiating centre of light. Only through the Incarnation of the already pre-existing Word can the return of humanity to God be effected. 'The Church is implied in Christ, in his power . . . The Church is—if one interprets favourably an expression which is capable of grave misunderstanding—the development of Christ in time' (Athanasius p.297). The Church is the Word of God continually present among men in human form, ever renewed and quickened by His Spirit, his permanent Incarnation.

Möhler's early subordination of exterior to interior is modified in the light of a better understanding of the Incarnation. Christ was visibly present to his disciples. The Word was made Flesh that he might be seen by human eyes, heard by human ears. The miracles of Christ, Möhler points out, are not to be thought of simply as a means of winning credibility for his teachings; they are visible signs of spiritual realities. A man is cured of a disease, and his sins are forgiven him. St Paul has not only a strong sense of the communion of saints, but he is equally aware of the crucial importance of the historical basis of the community: without the resurrection faith would be void. The Apostles were gathered together at Pentecost not by spontaneous inner impulse, but on the command of the Lord who told them to wait there until they received the Holy Spirit; and the Holy Spirit appeared visibly in the form of parted tongues of fire. The Spirit is still the architect of unity in the Church, but his action is neither random nor disparate nor purely invisible; as the Spirit of Christ he continues the pattern of the Incarnation, 'ut dum visibiliter Deum cognoscimus, per hunc in invisibilium amorem rapiamur.'

Now a Church conceived on the pattern of the Incarnation cannot be other than visible. The Church remains for Möhler an organic unity, satisfying both reason and the imagination, a community transcending differences of race and frontier, of men reconciled among themselves as they have been through Christ to God. But in the *Symbolik* he reinstates the position of authority in the Church, and unity is achieved not simply through an inner drive, but because the authority of Christ was imparted to the Apostles. Now it is the mission received from Christ which produces unity, not the dynamism from below. The authority of the Church is always mediate; it derives from Christ and without him would be empty formalism. But if the institutional Church, charged with the mission of making Christ known and present to the end of time, did not exist, then the divine plan for the reconciliation of man to Himself would remain unfulfilled. Möhler's dialectic now moves from exterior to interior: 'When through external media, the religious consciousness of the Apostles had been awakened by the Incarnate

Son of God, and they had, accordingly, received the outward calling to announce the Gospel to others; then, as instruments of Christ working within them, they impressed from without the image of the divine person on the interior of those who before had been stamped with the earthly one' (*Symbolik* §48). The external unity of the Church as Institution forms the inner unity of the Church as community; and the latter is the basis of the unity of the Church as institution.

Möhlér's ecclesiology received its final expression in the successive editions of the *Symbolik*, where the Church is understood on the basis of the Incarnation. One can thus express his previous positions in christological terms. In the Canon Law lectures had he not given too much independence to the human element in the Church and produced a form of ecclesiological Nestorianism? And in the *Einheit* had he not swung to the other extreme, underrated the institutional and staked all on the Holy Spirit, thus falling into ecclesiological Monophysitism? In the *Symbolik* he avoids such dangers. The Church has for its analogue the hypostatic union. 'The Church, his permanent manifestation, is at once both divine and human—she is the union of both. He it is who, concealed under earthly forms, works in the Church; and this is why she has indivisibly a divine and a human element, so much so that the divine cannot be separated from the human nor the human from the divine' (§36). That is why there is, in the Church, as in Christ, an exchange of predicates. And that is why, according to Möhlér, the Church is one and visible (10).

Notes :

- (1) *Die Einheit in der Kirche*, edited by J. R. Geiselman, Köln, 1956.
- (2) *Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken und Protestanten*, edited by J. R. Geiselman, Köln, 1958.
- (3) *L'Eglise est Une*, Paris, 1939, pp.127-193.
- (4) Op. cit. p. 133.
- (5) *Esquisses du Mystère de L'Eglise*, Paris, 1941, p.54.
- (6) This is a paraphrase of a remark by Drey, Möhlér's mentor at Tübingen.
- (7) Cf. B.D. Dupuy, Schisme et Primauté chez Möhlér, *Revue des Sciences Religieuses*, Avril-Juillet-Octobre 1960, pp. 197-231.
- (8) K. Eschweiler, *Johann Adam Möhlers Kirchenbegriff*, Braunsberg, 1930.
- (9) Cf. A. A. Stephenson, The Development and Immutability of Christian Doctrine, *Theological Studies*, 19, (1958), pp. 486-487.
- (10) Cf. Yves M-J Congar, *Dogme Christologique et Ecclésiologie; Vérité et Limites d'un Parallèle*, *Das Konzil von Chalkedon, III*, Würzburg, 1954, pp. 239-268.

THE WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES

ANTHONY LAWN, S.J.

THE World Council of Churches does not claim to be an end, but to be a means towards attaining the unity of Christianity, and it is a product of a much wider movement or tendency. The word ecumenical is frequently on the tongues and the pens of the members of the World Council, and this is rightly so, because the movement that gave birth to it is now known as the 'ecumenical movement'. This last title may well be misleading for a Catholic, especially in this time of preparation for an Ecumenical Council, and therefore we must consider

first, in brief, the ecumenical movement in order to try to understand the World Council of Churches.

Long before the World Council of Churches was thought of men had been exercised over the problems arising from St Paul's parable of the body as the Body of Christ, and the evident desire and prayer of Christ that His Church should have unity, that His followers should be one. We know, of course, that the one true Church of Christ, the Catholic Church founded upon the Rock, has never lost its unity. The tragedy is that so many who call upon the name of Christ are, usually through no fault of their own, separated from that unity. But in this article let us try to see things through the eyes of a sincere non-Catholic who thinks that the unity of the Church founded by Christ has in fact been broken up into many pieces, and who longs to join the pieces together again. He looks around him and sees a plurality of Christian 'Churches', each accepting a missionary responsibility; and this situation leads inevitably to clashes both in those areas technically designated missionary and at home—clashes that are a cause of scandal to Christian and non-Christian alike. The sincere Christian seeks in the practice of his religion for the peace and truth of Christ that he might reasonably expect from reading the Gospels, and is confronted with disunion, disagreement, opposition, widely different ideals, practices, doctrines; especially with regard to doctrine he will find not only differences, but even flat contradiction.

The one simple answer to the dilemma is unity, the unity of all Christians in one Church. The necessity of unity is so fundamental that it even troubled the Apostles at the first Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), it was the concern of both Pope and Patriarch because of the Great Schisms of East and West, it has occupied men's thought since the disruptions of the Reformation, and the manifold splinterings that have followed it. From the time of the first heresies and schisms there have been men who have spent their energies in trying to re-establish the unity of Christendom. Among the non-Catholics today a desire for or striving after unity is widely known as ecumenical.

The ecumenical desire and striving has given rise to the ecumenical movement, which appears in many ways. Various Churches of like doctrine, but in different localities, as the Baptists in America, have united; even churches with variant doctrines have united to form geographical churches; as in Southern India; throughout the world there is a greater tolerance among Christians for one another, a readiness to admit that each is sincere in his beliefs, and a readiness to help each other; there is also a readiness to meet each other, to discuss points of view and differences. All these manifestations of the ecumenical movement were largely the result of the action of individuals, rather than that of organised groups, and frequently there was no direct relation between one and another of them. But in 1910 a World Missionary Council was held in Edinburgh, and this was to be of great importance to the World Council of Churches, as may be seen from the following diagram:—

(World Missionary Council) Edinburgh 1910

1921 <u>International Missionary Council</u>	1927 <u>Faith & Order Lausanne</u>	1925 <u>Life & Work Stockholm</u>
1928 <u>Jerusalem</u>		1931 <u>Ecumenical Youth Commission</u>
	1937 <u>Edinburgh</u>	1937 <u>Oxford</u>
1938 <u>Tambaram (India)</u>	1938 <u>Utrecht</u>	1939 <u>Amsterdam</u>
1947 <u>Whitby (Canada)</u>		1947 <u>Oslo</u>
	1948 <u>Amsterdam</u>	
<u>Joint Committee</u>	WORLD COUNCIL OF CHURCHES	
1952 <u>Willingen (Germany)</u>	1952 <u>Lund (Sweden)</u>	
	1954 <u>Evanston (U.S.A.)</u>	
<u>Joint Division of Studies</u>		
1958 <u>Ghana</u>	1957 <u>Faith & Order Oberlin</u>	

Proposed integration of International Missionary Council and World Council of Churches to be placed before the General Assembly December, 1961, New Delhi.

The World Missionary Conference in Edinburgh 1910 was not a sudden phenomenon, but a conclusion to a series of co-operative movements and conferences among Anglo-Saxon missionary churches. Edinburgh 1910 was distinguished from previous conferences in that it was intended to be a world conference, and that it restricted its membership. The restriction was twofold; first, members were to be accredited by missionary societies; and secondly, only those societies that were concerned with the evangelization of non-Christians were eligible—thus excluding those who evangelized nations or peoples already attached to some other Christian Church. The purpose of the Conference was to develop common aims, leading to common action; it was, therefore, consultative and not legislative.

Eight commissions prepared the following subjects for discussion. (1) Carrying the Gospel to all the non-Christian World, (2) The Church in the Mission Field, (3) Education in relation to the Christianization of National Life, (4) The Missionary Message in relation to non-Christian Religions, (5) The Preparation of Missionaries, (6) The Home Base of Missions, (7) Missions and Governments, and (8) Co-operation and the Promotion of Unity. At the same time the following significant exclusion from discussion was made: No expression of opinion should be sought from the Conference on any matter involving any ecclesiastical or doctrinal questions on which those taking part in the Conference differed among themselves. By these means—the careful planning of the discussions, the very important exclusion, and the selection of members—Edinburgh 1910 went far towards the achievement of its purpose: that is, to foster a common, if somewhat vague, ideal that could be held by all, and to encourage joint action. In the concrete, and right at the end of the Conference, it was agreed to establish a continuation committee.

Probably the most important effect of the World Missionary Conference was that it brought together a number of remarkable men, and gave their minds a common meeting place in the discussions. Such men were J. E. Mott, Joseph Oldham, Charles Brent, Cheng Ching-yi, and many others. More than this, it gave them opportunity for further contact through the Continuation Committee. Despite the World War which intervened their interest and activity in the Continuation Committee led to its becoming the well established International Missionary Council in 1921.

Bishop Brent (then Bishop of the Philippine Islands, and later of Western New York) had agreed, in Edinburgh, to the wisdom of excluding matters of doctrine and ecclesiastical organisation, because by this means it was possible to aim at practical co-operation. But at the same time he saw that the causes of division among the churches would have to be examined, if they were going to be removed and unity restored to Christianity. At the Conference itself he did no more than mention the matter, but afterwards he continued to think and work on these lines, and eventually he was responsible for the formation of Faith and Order. The conferences of this movement were

distinct from those of the International Missionary Council in that its members were officially accredited from the churches, and its aim was to further theological understanding between those churches.

Archbishop Söderblom of Uppsala was influenced by all these attempts to further Christian Unity, but foresaw that it would be a long time before any unity of doctrine or organisation could be achieved. He therefore, with the encouragement and assistance of John R. Mott and J. H. Oldham, founded Life and Work. The aim of this movement was to help the churches in achieving some practical co-operation, and to help them to give a united witness to the world. As in Faith and Order, the members of Life and Work were accredited by the churches.

By 1927, then, there were three international bodies formed, all with the general aim of uniting the churches of Christendom. They were all predominantly of the West, and each was working on its own specialised field: missions, theology and organisation, and day to day practicality. None the less they were not entirely isolated, for the men concerned in each were those of Edinburgh 1910, and they met one another from time to time in the various conferences held by the three bodies (by no means all the activity is recorded in the diagram). The activity of each body was also of interest to the others, and there was a certain amount of overlapping of these activities. Inevitably men and organisations working for union must consider their own unity, and it is no surprise to find that Faith and Order united with Life and Work to form the World Council of Churches in 1948. The ease of this union was greatly helped, because the members of each were the accredited representatives of their churches.

A natural conclusion would be the integration of the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Churches. Since the formation of the latter in 1948 this integration has been put off as inopportune, but it will almost certainly take place in the next General Assembly of the World Council in New Delhi 1961 (Dec. 14). When that union takes place the intentions of Edinburgh will have reached the first stage of fulfilment. Then there was a vague hope for some sort of practical unity among the non-Catholic churches, as an expression of the true unity that Christ willed for His Church. Now there is an organised movement aiming at the unity of the 'Una Sancta', the One Holy Church. These organisations do not claim to be the Una Sancta, they deliberately reject any notion of authority over member churches. Even when the union of the remaining two bodies takes place, the new body will regard itself only as a guide to help the churches to the Una Sancta. The comparison has already been made between these organisations and St John the Baptist, who decreased that Christ might increase.

The World Council is an international and interdenominational organisation, and rejects all authority over its members churches. It embraces at least 180 'churches' in some 55 countries. It is a consultative organisation. The only power of its findings and publications is the wisdom and experience to be found in them. Based upon these facts it

wants to be universal, and therefore has left the door open to those churches that do not at present belong to it; outstanding among these (apart from the Catholic Church) are the Southern Baptist Convention (U.S.A.), the Missouri Synod Lutherans, and a large section of the Eastern Orthodox. It is well to remember that there are about as many non-Catholic Christians who do not belong to the World Council of Churches as those who do.

This universal aim of the World Council is not the selfish one of many organisations, but it is ecumenical. That is to say that the ultimate aim is not its own aggrandizement, but the reunion of all Christians in the One True Church. Such a praiseworthy aim is obviously not attainable in the immediate future, and therefore the Word Council makes its work the fostering of co-operation and joint action in the practical order: inter-church aid, comity agreements in the mission fields, frank discussion of differing views in order to remove prejudices and differences where possible, study of theology and ecclesiastical matters, study of international affairs and social conditions. By all these means the World Council of Churches has helped to create and strengthen the feeling of fellowship among Christians. Even further, the World Council has achieved an organisation of Christian Churches that has covenanted to 'stay together'. Possibly even more significant is the development of doctrine that is shown in the new 'basis' (doctrine to which all must subscribe, in order to join the Council); the old basis was 'The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which accept our Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour'; the new basis for the coming General Assembly is Trinitarian: 'The World Council of Churches is a fellowship of Churches which confess the Lord Jesus Christ as God and Saviour according to the Scriptures and therefore seek to fulfil together their common calling to the glory of the one God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit'.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A PLAIN ACCOUNT OF THE PEOPLE CALLED METHODISTS

SUCH was the title of a pamphlet by John Wesley, written in 1749, as an apologia designed to soften the intense antagonism towards the original Methodists expressed by fellow members of the Anglican Church. Perhaps no other denomination has clung so proudly to the teachings of its founder.

John Wesley was born in 1703, the son of an Anglican parson, and educated at Charterhouse and Christchurch. He took orders and became a fellow of Lincoln. After a short curacy in his father's parish he returned to Oxford in 1729 and joined the 'Holy Club', founded by his younger brother, Charles, and whose observance of the methods prescribed for students by the University Statutes earned them 'the harmless name of Methodists'. John assumed leadership of the group. Both brothers went to Georgia in 1735 for missionary work among the Indians; their desire was thwarted and they returned to England after two years. But the excursion had lasting effect; it brought them into contact with Moravians. In 1738 on separate occasions both experienced a 'conversion' and within a year John, in partnership with Charles and a friend from Oxford and Georgia days, George Whitefield, had established his own 'Societies' within the Anglican Church and had begun open-air preaching. Throughout his life his actions brought him into conflict with the authorities of the Established Church and though he realised separation was inevitable he strove to maintain the connection between the Church and Societies. He died in 1791 having set up a strong national organisation dominated by his personality and his views with a vigorous off-shoot in America which had its own independent existence.

For the ordinary member of the Methodist Church no doctrinal test exists save 'a desire to be saved from sin and the wrath to come, and a saving faith in Jesus Christ' (1). But these imply, if not a precisely enunciated doctrine, a specific approach to salvation and justification.

Upon the ministers and some other officials, however, more explicit tests are imposed. These find their origin in Wesley's own 'Model Deed' of 1763. This deed was prepared for use in his preaching houses—meeting places for his 'Societies' who, in the main, accepted the ministrations of the Anglican Church and attended its services. Not until four years after Wesley's death was there a final separation from the Church of England in 1795, although the die had been cast irrevocably in 1784 by Wesley's ordination of ministers. It was stipulated that preachers should preach 'no doctrine other than is contained in Mr Wesley's Notes on the New Testament and the four volumes of Sermons' (2). These two works are called The Standards and the four volumes contain forty-four sermons in which 'the serious reader . . . will readily observe that there is scarce any subject of importance, either in practical or controversial divinity, which is not treated of more or less, either professedly or occasionally' (3).

In some respects the current deed is somewhat less positive; the Trustees of a local Methodist Church may not permit anyone to preach who maintains or teaches a doctrine *contrary* to the Standards. The local Trustees are judges of a minister's orthodoxy in *preaching* but not in *belief*. However, the Conference—an elected body, meeting annually, the supreme authority for the Methodist Church—has legislated further. A candidate for the ministry must have read and approved the Standards; he must pass an oral examination in Wesley's works—particularly the Standards; he must promise to retire quietly from the ministry should his views on doctrine change. At ordination he is asked if he holds that the Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine necessary for salvation through faith in Jesus Christ, and if he is determined to preach nothing as required for salvation unless proved by Scripture. He is also asked if he believes that 'the system of doctrine' contained in the Standards is in accord with the Scriptures. In 1814 the Conference made a list of doctrines to which each candidate must give an unequivocal assent: viz, 'a Trinity of Persons in the Unity of the Godhead; the total depravity of all men by nature in consequence of Adam's fall; the atonement made by Christ for the sins of all the human race; justification by faith; the absolute necessity of holiness both in heart and life; the direct witness of the Spirit and the proper eternity of future rewards and punishments' (4); to these were added, in 1827, 'the Eternal Sonship of Christ'.

One may observe that it is conformity to the general outline, the 'system of doctrine', and not isolated texts in the Standards that is promised. According to Sugden (5) the doctrines embraced by the Standards are 'justification by faith; entire sanctification; the atonement of Our Lord; assurance of pardon by the witness of the Spirit; the impossibility of a sincere Seeker after the Truth being lost and free grace as opposed to predestinarianism. The eternal punishment of the finally impenitent is also affirmed, but it is expressly stated that this applies only to those who have heard the Gospel'.

Such, then, is the historical bedrock of Methodist profession—although, be it noted, any meticulous and restrictive enunciation of a creed would be abhorrent to most Methodists. Since the structure is inexactly defined, it is to be expected that opinions expressed somewhat differently from Wesley's own will be found currently among his followers. Sugden (6) argues a distinction between *difference* and *contrariety*; as a flower is different from, not contrary to, the bud, so 'our statements, even of the peculiar Methodist doctrines, may be different from, without being contrary to, John Wesley's'.

Mention may be made of two additional points of doctrine. John Wesley's teaching on the Eucharist was emphatically Calvinistic—the species are a figure, a seal, a sign (7). Some Methodists, favouring a Lutheran consubstantiation theory, appeal to Charles Wesley's hymns (8), but the majority would reject this. Again, John Wesley was firm in his rejection of any *ex opere operato* efficacy of the two scriptural sacraments, baptism and the eucharist (9).

The Church was, for Wesley, 'the whole body of men endued with faith working by love, dispersed over the whole earth'; true belief, i.e., his brand of faith, is the criterion of its membership and all unholy men are excluded. His attitude to its authority and ordinances was pragmatic; whatever worked for the salvation of souls was good, otherwise he was ready to ignore or contradict it. He may be quoted as abusing as 'execrable wretches' members of the earlier Councils, and accusing the Church of Rome of introducing 'unscriptural and novel corruptions'—e.g., seven sacraments, transubstantiation, purgatory, indulgences, prayer to the saints, relics, the primacy, etc. (10). From a man who had read widely in theology and even many devotional Catholic works, these statements could not come without reflection. Nonetheless he undoubtedly accepted the 18th century prejudice against all 'Romanism'.

Wesley himself added little to the systematic theology of Protestantism, but his insistence on free grace offered to all men and the need for an active individual pursuit of holiness—encouraged and sustained by fellowship in the Society (i.e., congregation)—has had a strong influence not limited to the Methodist Church. The adherence to a strict Calvinist theory of predestination among the Free Churches has weakened owing, in large measure, to the vehemence of his preaching against its advocates who, he asserted, used 'arguments worthy of Bedlam and language worthy of Billingsgate'. In an age where the practice of religion had become for the majority a mere formality generally half-heartedly accepted and pessimistically pursued, he was outstanding, although not alone, in recalling the enlivening joy of serving Christ 'who died FOR ME'. He was intolerant of the aberration, not infrequently found among the 'enthusiasts' of his day, that the justified man could commit no sin no matter how violently his actions might transgress the moral law.

For an adequate brief summary of the history of Methodism one may consult 'Our Separated Brethren' by Fr Woodard (C.T.S., 1956, 1/-). Chapters XVIII to XXI of Mgr Knox's 'Enthusiasm' show Wesley and his work on a broader canvas. Among non-Catholic works the brief account by Dr Carpenter in chapter XI of 'Eighteenth Century Church and People' is lively and fair. From a Methodist pen, an excellent account of the founder and Methodist doctrines is given in 'The Spirit of Methodism' by H. Bett (Epworth Press, 1937).

Joseph Raybould, S.J.

References :

- (1) The standard Sermons of John Wesley; Annotated by E. H. Sugden, (Epworth Press, 1951), Intro. p. 17.
- (2) *loc cit.*
- (3) *Ibid.* p. 14.
- (4) *Ibid.* p. 22.
- (5) *Ibid.* p. 19.
- (6) *Ibid.* p. 23.
- (7) 'The Spirit of Methodism,' H. Bett; p. 84.
- (8) e.g. in 'From Luther to Wesley,' F. Hildebrandt, (Lutterworth Press, 1951).
- (9) Standard sermons, pp. 237-260; Bett, Op. cit. p. 83.
- (10) Bett, Op. cit. p. 66.

THE EASTERN ORTHODOX CHURCH

THE Eastern Orthodox Church, with approximately one hundred and fifty million adherents, ranks second in size among Christian bodies. It is the predominant faith of Eastern Europe and it is also represented in Asia, America and Australia.

What it teaches is largely the same as our Catholic Faith; besides containing the same precepts of morality, it worships God with a liturgy and with rites which are shared by Eastern Catholics, and which are recognised to be of equal authenticity with those of the Roman Rite.

The purpose of this short note is to study briefly the structure of this Church which was once a part of the true Church, owning the authority of the Holy Father, and to examine its general position in the world today.

The Eastern Orthodox Church—the term *orthodox* was originally given to those Christians who were faithful to the Council of Chalcedon in 451—can be defined as a federation of separate self-governing Churches, all of which have emerged in the course of history from the Imperial Byzantine Church of the first millennium A.D. Although the divisions were originally territorial, and not based on race or nationality, owing to secular history and politics, with which Orthodoxy has unfortunately always been yoked, the Churches have evolved as self-governing national units.

The unifying principle among these different Churches is the common possession of the same faith, the same liturgy, the same corpus of doctrine and Canon Law, and a common type of spirituality. There is no external juridical bond uniting them corresponding to the authority vested in the Supreme Pontiff in the Catholic Church. The Patriarch of Constantinople, styled the Ecumenical Patriarch, has in the course of history attempted to secure for himself a position of authority similar to that of the Pope, but without lasting success. As Bishop of 'the Great Church' he occupies a place of honour among the other rulers of the Orthodox Church, but simply as 'primus inter pares'. He has certain privileges, such as that of being able to convene Councils, but the legislation from these Councils derives its authority from the majority decision only.

In theory, the Churches of the confederation are either autocephalous or autonomous. The autocephalous Churches are completely independent of any outside authority, while the autonomous Churches, although self-governing, are still under the jurisdiction—in practice, very limited—of a patriarch or other hierarch outside themselves.

In each individual Church the Patriarch or chief Bishop, who might be the Catholicos, or the Exarch, or an Archbishop, governs through an assembly of bishops known as the Holy Synod. He now tends more and more to be merely the president of this assembly without much scope for personal initiative. And as the civil power is often represented, the bishop's freedom of action, even in his own sphere, is frequently hampered. The bishop in his own diocese is subject to the Synod and its president.

In diocesan government the local bishop is assisted, not by a chapter, as in the West, but by two councils; one for spiritual matters, and another for temporal affairs. The former is composed of clergy, and the latter of clergy and laity. The bishop has his own personal staff—a 'Vicar General' and a Curia.

Parishes are administered by one or more councils for temporal affairs, of which the parish priest is not necessarily a member. The parish priest is sometimes chosen by the parishioners at large, but he has to receive the approval of the bishop. The pastoral clergy are nearly all married. The rule is that a married man may be ordained deacon or priest and retain his wife. A man may not marry after he has received the diaconate; nor, if he has already been married, may he remarry on the death of his wife.

The diaconate is a permanent order, and not necessarily a step on the way towards the priesthood. In solemn liturgies priests are not permitted to perform the duties of deacons. Bishops must be single or widowers, and they must at least have received the monastic habit before being elevated to the episcopate. In practice, few Orthodox bishops have led the monastic life, although they are technically monks.

Monasticism is less developed than in the West. There has been no oriental counterpart of St Benedict, and the Easterns follow the more ancient code of St Basil. Eastern monasticism is directed towards the eremitical life. There is no noviceship or profession in the Western sense. A candidate is admitted to the monastery as a monk of the lowest grade, and after three years he advances to the second grade, when he is tonsured and takes the vows of poverty, chastity, obedience and stability. The candidate is not obliged to move on to this grade; he may remain indefinitely in the lowest grade if he chooses. Community life is merely a preparation for the eremitical state and for the life of solitary prayer and penance. This state, however, requires some twenty or thirty years of preparation in community. When a monk feels that the time has come to embrace the life of solitude, he enters upon the third and highest monastic grade.

Orthodox monks are seldom priests; potential bishops are usually chosen from the ranks of the second-grade monks. Within the community no distinction is made between monks of one grade and those of another, or between priests and non-priests. Any monk, of any grade, may become the abbot.

Orthodox monasticism takes its most striking form on Mount Athos. This mountain is a promontory jutting into the Aegean Sea. It supports twenty great monasteries and twelve smaller ones, two hundred cells or groups of hermitages, each under an elder, and four hundred and fifty other hermitages, some of which are organised into more austere groups. The Greeks are in a majority, but the Russians and the Rumanians are well represented. In fact, monks from nearly all the Orthodox Churches may be found on Athos. All the houses are bound together in a loose federation and presided over by a representative council. No woman is ever allowed to set foot on Mount Athos.

Today, the Orthodox confederacy embraces the ancient patriarchates of Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, all of them mere shadows of their former selves, and the newer patriarchates and churches of Russia, Yugoslavia, Rumania, Greece, Poland, Bulgaria, Georgia, Albania, Cyprus, Sinai, Finland, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia and Czechoslovakia. Many of these have dependent branches in Australia and America, several of which have increased greatly in size since the Communist domination of Eastern Europe after the second World War.

In common with other religious bodies, the Orthodox Churches are having to face a bitter struggle against materialism and secularism. The clergy for the most part are miserably underpaid and in serious need of sound theological training. In a number of countries a brave attempt is being made by the authorities, who often include men of great learning and holiness, to raise the standards.

The tradition of preaching and instructing the laity is not strong, and little is done to strengthen the spiritually weak and to recover those who fall away. On the other hand, the religious life of the people does not seem to require these ministrations of the clergy to keep it alive. They draw great strength from a faithful participation in the liturgy, a participation practised to a degree unfortunately rare in the Catholic Church. Nevertheless, where instruction is lacking in rural areas, superstition inevitably creeps in, but that is a defect not confined to the Orthodox alone.

A certain disharmony remains among some of the Churches. Of late, the patriarchate of Moscow, following the principle that carried Constantinople to great eminence, namely, that the more important a city is politically, the more important should be its episcopal see, seems to be attempting to diminish the position of Constantinople by drawing under its own influence those Churches in the satellite countries which before were inclined to look to the Ecumenical Patriarch for guidance. It is also interesting to note that Constantinople was not one of the scheduled stops when the Patriarch Alexei of Moscow made a tour of other patriarchates in 1960. Close association with the civil power remains therefore as an element of discord in the great legacy of the Orthodox Churches.

Manus Keane, S.J.

BANTU PHILOSOPHY: A FIELD FOR ADAPTATION?

WHEN a mother buys clothes for her baby she has at least two problems of adaptation before her: how much will the baby grow? how long will the clothes take to wear out? Although her problem is not easy, she might console herself with the thought that whether her baby grows quickly or slowly it will, unlike the baby of 'Alice in Wonderland', retain its same basic shape; and that is what we might call the basic element in the situation.

The Church's missionary problem of adaptation is a good deal more complex than that of fitting clothes that wear out to a baby that grows up. In the Church we can distinguish its essential structure from the

contingent environmental superstructure, its essential message from the non-essential modes of expression. We expect, moreover, that when a new culture merges with the Church, both will be enriched. The culture is given a new spirit and a new goal; the Church finds at her disposal a new medium in which to express her message, new eyes to see fresh aspects of her eternal truth.

But in Africa, where the cultural and political situation is so fluid, where traditional ways of living and social structures are being drastically altered, we might wonder whether there does exist any constant cultural structure. Under this lusty growth, is there anything that retains its essential shape and structure? Is 'Negritude' a mere slogan, or does it give a name to a dynamic and fertile culture force? If 'Negritude' is an authentic culture, and not a mere catch-word, we should find in it a characteristic approach to reality, certain patterns of thought, certain criteria and values that constitute a philosophy.

It is interesting to note that in a recently translated book, Father Placide Tempels' 'Philosophie Bantoue' (1), just such a philosophy is claimed to exist. What we have here is a compact system, expressed in a more or less scholastic terminology, resting on and growing out of this single proposition: the ultimate reality of Bantu thought is *force*. It is worth lingering on this idea for a while, for on it the whole system stands or falls. It is the key to all that follows, for what follows is in fact little more than the development of this theme.

The ultimate reality of Bantu thought is then, *force*. This *force* has a status exactly equivalent to that of being in Scholastic Philosophy. It is in virtue of this reality that all things have a common element. The reality of all things, divine, human, and inanimate, is their *life-force*. Where the scholastic says 'it is', the Bantu says, 'it has-and-exerts-power'. Not that there is a single, solitary world-force, as the Dynamists say; rather, each individual being is a *force* in itself; nor is it an isolated and circumscribed individualistic *force*. It is in constant relationship with other *forces*; it is a *force* that can develop or diminish; it is at a point in the complex network of *forces* which constitute reality. There is, moreover, a strict hierarchy of *forces*; God is the giver of life; the ancestors, because of their closeness to God and their superior experience and wisdom, mediate vital *force*. A child is ever dependent on the vital *force* of its parents; a tribe always finds its strength in the life of its chief. These relations are permanent, bridging even the gap of death.

But there is a two-way relationship: for instance, human beings in this system not only influence lower forms of being, but also tap their *force*; these beings are considered to exist for man's sake, for man is in a very special way the measure of the Bantu world. Even the dead, whose superior status in the *force-hierarchy*, whose great knowledge and intense vital *force* give power to the living, have a real need of the living as an object for their influence. For if they had nobody to influence, their *force*, which is essentially relative, would have no term to its relation; it would be sterile, and really no *force* at all.

Bantu wisdom is, naturally enough, concerned with the discern-

ment of these all-important vital *forces*. If you want to be a wise man, you must assess with care your status in the *force-network*. You must appreciate and acknowledge your dependence on the superior *forces*, understand the scope of your own *force* and the duties arising from it. This is the essential wisdom passed on by the old people, and though necessary for the harmonious ordering of *forces*. There is a further knowledge, more akin to natural science, where a man sets out to utilize the *forces* of material things. He has certain laws to guide him, (the idea of sympathy, for example, and the law that ownership creates some sort of ontological relationship between the person and his possession), but he understands that his efforts to exploit the tangled maze of material *forces* must always be rather a hit-and-miss affair.

Man himself, a vital *force* like any other vital *force*, capable of an increased intensity of power, is poised between the world of the greater *forces* that are exerted on him, and the world of the lesser *forces* that depend on him. But he is, moreover, clearly recognized as an individual, having a unique status within the clan, and his name is the external manifestation of this reality. This is not, of course, his common name, which is no more than a label that anyone can bandy about, but an inner name, which never changes because what it represents never changes.

The Bantu ethics would, in theory, emerge very smoothly from what has been said. Objective good is whatever promotes the increase of vital *force*; whatever tends to the maintaining of the world order and the correct *force-hierarchy* is likewise good, for it is promoting the ideal *force-situation* sanctioned by the divine will. From this ontological good, ethical and juridical good follow. Hence human law should be in accord with what is ontologically moral—except, of course, where bad customs have arisen and been tolerated.

Subjective morality is for the Bantu rather a complex idea. There are three types of person recognized. The ordinary man, who is good, but liable, under the influence of passion or some other external influence, to will evil; to will, that is, the destruction of *life-force* or the disruption of the hierarchical order.

Besides the ordinary man, there is the tragic outer fringe. There is the pervert, the destroyer (such as the witch), whose whole being is set on destruction. The community recognizes its right to defend itself, even with great brutality, against an evil and public enemy. On this fringe too, is the unconscious evil influence: the deformed, the sick, the monster. Their external deformity is presumed to be a reflection of their inner *force*, and with all the good will in the world, such a *force* is liable to damage the ontological order. This would be the mentality behind the killing of twins and the deformed, and behind other seemingly callous actions, so often condemned and so frequently misunderstood.

Such then, is the bare outline of the mould in which, it is claimed, Bantu thought is cast. If this is a correct assessment, what follows? It is clear that this system must demand the attention and the respect of

those who work with Africans. The missionary and the teacher must approach the African, not in an attitude of over-bearing self-assurance, noisily jangling his bunch of keys to all solutions. He must not come to impose and to indoctrinate, to create a fake Europe on the corpse of African culture. Rather, he must carry his wares humbly, with caution and respect, prepared to offer his teaching in such a way that the African can accept it. He must try to penetrate the Bantu thought-processes, so that his teaching and religious message may be integrated in the already existing structure.

His appeal is that of Pope Pius XII, who said that the Church, though aiming at unity, 'does not aim at uniformity, which would only be external in its effects and would cramp the natural tendencies of the nations concerned' (2), but on the contrary, 'the Church takes up the fulness of all that is genuinely human, wherever and however she finds it, and elevates it by her supernatural power' (3); 'And it is a matter of no consequence', says the present Pope, 'that these things may not always spring from Mediterranean lands, which in God's Providence formed the cradle of her own infancy' (4).

This is not, of course, a solution to the problem of adaptation at the practical level. We do not find in 'Philosophie Bantoue' a cultural blue-print for any Bantu-Christian society. But we have as a starting-point a certain esteem for existing African culture, and though the educator or missionary may be unable to deduce exactly what is and is not in keeping with the general principles of Bantu thought, he has at his disposal a standard of reference. Thus he will be inclined to give close attention and full scope to spontaneous African reactions to his teaching. He will distinguish the truths offered from the form in which they are presented, and he will not be disappointed to see them reproduced in vastly different forms. In fact he could ask for no greater recommendation of his work.

Henry Wardale, S.J.

References :

- (1) Bantu Philosophy, by Father Placide Tempels. English translation published by Présence Africaine, Paris, 1959.
- (2) Pope Pius XII, Encyclical 'Summi Pontificatus,' 1939.
- (3) Pope Pius XII, Christmas Message, 1945.
- (4) Pope John XXIII, Encyclical 'Princeps Pastorum,' 1959.

SYSTEMATIC LUTHERANISM: PAUL TILlich

THE Lutheran theologian Paul Tillich attracts a very wide audience in the United States, where an issue of *Time* magazine was recently devoted to his teaching. Since his lectures draw many young people and influence their religious thought, this digest of Tillich's systematic theology has been made, but it is presented with the caution that many Lutherans would be against such a systematisation, and that he does not represent Lutheranism in general.

Tillich uses the language of modern philosophy, and his system can be reduced to:

- (a) *Existential questions*, which are the problems which arise from life

as we see it.

(b) *Theological answers*, which are the answers to the existential questions, and which are to be found in demythologised scripture—that is, in its symbolic rather than in its literal content.

The place of Natural Theology. 'None of the conclusions which argue for the existence of God is valid' (1). Natural Theology is not useless, but its use is limited to the raising of meaningful questions. It is revelation alone which supplies the answers to these questions. Thus, Natural Theology tells us that the question 'Does God exist?' is not meaningless, but the affirmative answer can only be supplied with certainty by revelation within the framework of Scripture. This relationship between question and answer is called the 'theological circle'—existential questions with theological answers. All this is due to the fact that 'God is manifest only through God' (2).

The Estrangement of Man. There was no real historical event corresponding to the fall of Adam, but the demythologising of the book of Genesis reveals the ancient Jewish belief that man is estranged to that supernatural which is part of his nature. Evil, suffering and concupiscence (understood as the rebellion of instinct in general and not of just the sex instinct) are all symptoms of man's estrangement. The estrangement is inescapable in that there is no human activity which is not self-regarding. Even agnostic doubt is a symptom of estrangement. All this is the expression of a hidden desire to be like God. In the last analysis 'estranged existence' is identical with 'actualised creation' as a fact, but not as a matter of intrinsic necessity.

Man's Redemption. The historical Christ is lost, but the New Testament, even after demythologising is full of pointers giving a clear picture of Christ in his function of mediator and redeemer.

Christ is God and so he conquers man's estrangement. The analysis of man as he exists gives the 'existential question'; the New Testament gives the corresponding 'theological answer'. The story of Christ from his birth to his resurrection symbolises the conquest of estrangement; a miracle symbolises part-conquest. The literal value of events is subordinate to their symbolic value—indeed, the literal value can often be questioned.

Thus the symbol of the cross of Christ shows that in exposing himself to the ultimate negatives of existence, he is still united with his Father and so is able to conquer estrangement. The conquest of estrangement is the Redemption.

The reality of man's estrangement, however, persists even after conversion, yet he has realised the impossibility of self-salvation and has accepted vicarious atonement from Christ. Tillich points out the great difficulty of impressing such a notion of salvation on the men of the twentieth century, where the self-reliance of man has such a wide acceptance.

The Psychology of Conversion

Man seeks salvation, the escape from the 'human predicament' of 'estrangement' in two ways:

(a) By self-affirmation. This is the way of those who seek to throw off psychological inhibitions, of those who become existentialists, and of those who make money and power their religion.

(b) By self-subordination to the group. This means losing one's identity in the group, as the Communists do—or even the football crowds.

Both these ways are doomed to end in failure, and a man is left hopeless and helpless—'in the boundary situation'. The only way forward from this state is by the grace of salvation by faith, by the acceptance of the Gospel.

The dominant theme of the 'boundary situation' has changed in history. In the early Church it was the anxiety about death, as the early martyrs show; in Reformation times it was the anxiety of guilt, as can be seen in Luther himself; in our modern times it is the anxiety of meaninglessness, and no age has produced such a crop of agnostics. Again we have here 'existential questions', for which there are 'theological answers'.

The answer to the first question is eternal life; that to the second is salvation by faith. The answer to the third may be given in Tillich's own words: 'The source of affirmation of meaning within meaninglessness, of certitude within doubt, is not the God of traditional theism, but the "God above God", the power of being'. By this Tillich means that the usual anthropomorphic terms fall short of God, reducing him to finitude. The only way out is to make the existential question fully meaningful by seeing the absolute transcendence of God (God above God) and by finding the theological answer in a deliteralised Gospel message.

Obviously there is much in Tillich's theology which Catholic theology must reject; but his technique of applying the 'theological circle' is not without merit.

Leopold Leblique, S.J.

References :

- (1) Tillich, *Systematic Theology*, Vol. 2, p. 15.
- (2) *Ibid.*

REVIEWS

Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. By Francis Clark, S.J. Pp. x, 582. Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1960. 50s.

EVEN so sympathetic a friend of Anglicanism as Baron von Hügel, when confronted with the argument that Cranmer and his associates were opposed only to current abuses of the Mass and not to the Mass itself, remarked sadly that the breaking of altars was a strange way to express approval.

The Evangelical wing of the Church of England, of course, finds the eucharistic views of the Reformers no embarrassment. But the more Catholic-minded, who adhere to the traditional view of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist and who are at pains to defend the validity of their orders, are forced to try to read a Catholic interpretation into the Prayer Book and the 31st Article, and to explain the 'blasphemous

fables and dangerous deceits', to which the Article alludes, as an attack on late-medieval errors about the Mass and not on the Mass itself.

The Franciscan Davenport (Sancta Clara) invented this line of defence in the tolerant days of Charles I, and the Abbé Le Couraye revived it in the following century, but it did not gain wide-spread notice until the time of the Tractarians. Since then the argument has been used in two forms. One line is to concede the heterodoxy of Cranmer and his associates, but to insist that the Prayer Book and Articles are capable of a Catholic interpretation despite the mind of the framers. Newman and W. G. Ward (before their conversion) as well as Darwell Stone and G. Dix argued in this way; but most Anglicans are reluctant to condemn their founding fathers so bluntly. Therefore the commoner line has been to defend the orthodoxy of the English Reformers; their aim, it is claimed, was not to deny the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist, but simply to remove the theoretical and practical abuses that had sprung up around the Mass in pre-Reformation times. Fr Clark's book is an exhaustive refutation of this second form of the argument.

Among the alleged practical abuses were a superstitious confidence in the temporal rewards of hearing Mass and in the efficacy of certain numbers of Masses to release souls from Purgatory, clerical avarice in exacting Mass stipends, over-emphasis of the priest's part in the Mass, and an excessively complicated liturgy. The charges, Fr Clark admits, have some truth, though not as much as is claimed. But even if the picture were as black as it is painted, it would not vindicate Cranmer for his attack was on the Mass, and not only on its misuse. Even if his aim was to empty out the dirty bath-water, out went the baby too.

To the doctrinal errors which are said to have been current in the Church before the Reformation Fr Clark devotes some three hundred pages. The exponents of the argument do not impugn official Roman teaching, or even necessarily the teaching of the academic theologians of the time. Cranmer's aim, they allege, was to prune Eucharistic belief of the errors which had been grafted on to it by popular preaching, not by scholastic treatises. Fr Clark draws up a syllabus of sixteen such alleged errors, traces them to their source (a task which at times calls for original detective work), and generally demolishes the charge with astonishing conviction. For good measure he adds as appendices two catenae of texts, the first of which illustrates the Eucharistic teaching of pre-Reformation and counter-Reformation theologians; the second is particularly interesting, being a collection of texts illustrating the 'popular theology' of the Mass in the two centuries before the Reformation.

But Fr Clark is not content with defending the pre-Reformation Church. In the three most valuable chapters of the book he proves convincingly that the Reformers, both continental and English, were opposed to the Mass for its own sake, and were logically forced to be so by their theological premises. The removal of all mention of sacrifice from the Prayer Book and the Ordinal confirms this.

The book is remarkable for the author's powers of exposition (it contains incidentally a useful summary of modern Catholic Eucharistic theology) and for the thoroughness of his research and piece-meal demolition of his opponents' case. His argument seems unanswerable. But the reader may feel some regret that so controversial a work, however charitable its spirit, should appear at the present, when we happily breathe so eirenic an atmosphere. But here again Fr Clark has the last word. Truth, as well as love, he reminds us with quotations, must rule ecumenical debate. We must not shut our eyes to our differences, but bring them to light and try to resolve them.

Edward Yarnold, S.J.

City of Wrong: a Friday in Jerusalem. By M. Kamel Hussein. Translated from the Arabic with an Introduction by Kenneth Cragg. Pp. 25, 225. Geoffrey Bles, London. 1959. 21s.

A SURGEON and former president of Ibrahim 'Ain al-Shams University of Cairo, Dr M. Kamel Hussein has written on a broad variety of topics: from ancient Egyptian medicine and early Arab medical science to Koranic theology and Jewish history. His *City of Wrong* is an attempt to assess the moral responsibility of those who crucified Jesus of Nazareth.

It is most interesting to see a Muslim devote his research to such a subject. In so doing, however, he does not overstep the boundaries of the Muslim belief that the crucifying of Jesus did not actually happen (1). The Jews indeed were tricked by God in a mysterious way: they thought they killed Christ but they did not do so because he was raised unto God. Of course, their moral responsibility remains the same as if they had actually done it. Thus Dr Hussein deals with the crucifixion as if it had happened and he is concerned with assessing its wrongness from a human standpoint.

On Good Friday, the Jews went astray because they did not follow the dictates of their conscience. This is the supreme evil and the prototype of all sins. From then on, Jerusalem has become the *City of Wrong*, a symbol of the wrongness found in humanity at large. 'On that day', the author writes, 'men willed to murder their conscience and that decision constitutes the supreme tragedy of humanity' (2).

So far, so good. But what does the author mean by conscience? A gift of God, conscience would precisely be what God breathed into man when He created him. Pressed to explain further, the author goes on to write: 'Without it, man would not be man. Reason, intelligence, speech skill, are attributes of which the animals might conceivably have been capable had they attained a sufficient degree of progress and without thereby becoming human' (3). Thus conscience rules over reason; its laws are different from and superior to the laws of reason.

Aristotelian and Thomist philosophy as well as Catholic teaching disagree with such a statement. When God created man, he breathed into him a human soul, that would act as the source and principle of man's rationality and, in so doing, distinguish him from the other

animals. As for conscience, it flows from reason itself and never opposes it: rather it is a reason enlightening and ruling man's conduct. Hence by following the dictates of his conscience, man obeys his reason. One agrees with the author that conscience must be the 'court of appeal' and the guide of man in reaching a moral decision provided that conscience be itself guided by reason and be, so to say, its spokesman.

The opposition between reason and conscience shows up now and again in Dr Hussein's book. It underlies, for instance, the discussion of the alleged motives for the crucifixion. The Jews acted rationally but against their conscience. The Jews, I agree, tried very hard to *rationalize* their conduct and thus appease their conscience. Isn't it a well-known fact that a criminal always looks for *reasons* to justify his crime? But who will conclude that he obeys his reason when he commits the crime? No, the determining factors are to be found elsewhere.

Among the *reasons* put forward by the Jews, Dr Hussein singles out the following two: the preaching by Jesus of social equality and of a God of love (4). But one wonders whether such motives played the part the author seems to assign to them. In the proceedings before the Sanhedrin as reported by the Evangelists, the great claim which provoked the death sentence is Jesus' claim to be the Messiah (5). Dr Hussein has unfortunately left out this part of the story.

Even though a Catholic finds it impossible to agree with Dr Hussein's analysis of conscience and of the motives of the crucifixion, he cannot but hope that his example will be followed by other Muslims. May a closer study of the historical documents and the help of God's grace lead many of them to catch a glimpse of the mystery of Christ's Passion and Resurrection.

Amédée Payeur, S.J.

References :

- (1) Koran IV.156.
 - (2) City of Wrong, p. 4.
 - (3) *ibid.*, 128-129. Similarly on p. 90.
 - (4) *ibid.*, 12.
 - (5) Mt 26.59-61; Mk 19.53-65.
- Cf. also Dr Josef Blinzler, *The Trial of Jesus*, The Newman Press, 1959, pp. 98-110.

An American Dialogue. By Robert McAfee Brown and Gustave Weigel, S.J. Pp.216. Doubleday, New York, 1960. \$2.95.

THIS book in which 'a Protestant looks at Catholicism and a Catholic looks at Protestantism' is, despite a certain unevenness, a novel contribution to current Ecumenical literature. The principle which inspires the two essays is that both Protestant and Catholic should meet to discuss each other's position. This discussion or dialogue should not take the form of a polemical argument, but should be a clear statement of beliefs. Dr Brown and Fr Weigel contend that it is impossible to hope for any attempt at reunion until each side has fully understood the position of the other. Such an idea is as welcome as it is admirable. The fact that the dialogue is set in an American context does not subtract anything from the validity of the arguments, for the problems

confronting Catholics and Protestants in the New World are largely those which have to be faced in the Old, except that there is no official State religion in America. Incidentally much light is thrown on the American religious scene where it touches the political. I wish I could have read the book before the recent Presidential election rather than after it.

The deepest impression left by Dr Brown's examination of Catholicism is one of breath-taking charity. The reader is caught up in the first few pages of the essay by the utter candour and goodwill of the author, and his warm, sympathetic treatment of his subject is at once fair and compelling. (Rarely have I so intensely felt what a pleasure it would be to meet the author of what I was reading). More important than the actual exposition of the Catholic faith as seen by an objective Protestant, is the list of proposals Dr Brown makes for the conduct of a fruitful dialogue in Chapter Two. He insists that each partner must believe in the good faith of the other, clearly understand his own faith and strive to understand clearly the position of the other. All this should be done in a spirit of prayer and humility. In the phrase 'separated brethren', the emphasis must always be put on the word 'brethren'.

Fr Weigel's essay is less satisfying. He has, admittedly, the more difficult task. Whereas the teaching of the Catholic Church is clearly set out, for anyone to study who wishes—not that every non-Catholic can view it with the understanding of Dr Brown—the number of divisions within Protestantism makes it hard for the outsider to obtain a composite picture. Again, as Fr Weigel remarks, if there was no Catholic Church, there would be no Protestant churches. Nevertheless, Fr Weigel seems to be anxious to justify Catholic teaching at the same time as he is commenting on Protestant beliefs as he sees them. This partly spoils the force of the latter. He does make the same appeal as Dr Brown for a dialogue between Catholics and Protestants, but points out that the Catholic cannot compromise in the ultimate reunion. The Church prays and hopes that all Christians, to use the words of Archbishop Heenan, 'will go on loving one another until they all come to see the same truth'.

In a word, here is a book for all interested in Ecumenical approaches—and even more for those not yet interested. The charity and candour of both authors cover the blemishes of notes being at the back of the book and not at the foot of the pages and a few ugly neologisms. May this American dialogue prove to be a stimulus to Catholics and non-Catholics in other countries to produce their own dialogues.

Peter Banyard, S.J.

Christendom. By Einar Molland. Pp.xiv, 418. Mowbrays, London, 1959. 35s.

CONVERSATION without a common language is impossible, but more bewildering is conversation through a Looking-Glass where each word means 'just what I choose it to mean'. Yet too often has

this been the predicament of Christian Churches, who enjoy a common terminology which often only serves to cloak differences of meaning or connotation. To reach an understanding of other confessions, it is not sufficient to interpret their ideas into one's own terms but it is essential to appreciate their concepts in the proper context and from the point of view of those who hold them. Without such understanding and sympathy the question of Christian reunion can hardly be broached, and even united effort against common enemies remains impracticable.

Professor Molland offers the material for such understanding. He aims to describe each of the Churches not from his own point of view as a Lutheran, but as objectively as possible and in terms acceptable to adherents of those Churches, comparing one with another only when such a comparison clarifies the main characteristics of each one. For ease of comparison, they are arranged in order beginning with what the author calls the 'Right Wing' or traditionalist Churches and ending with the 'Left Wing' Churches that have lost or rejected the traditions of the early Church. This order not only has the convenience of grouping together those that are most easily compared, but it is also the order in which they emerged historically; but care must be had to avoid comparisons and conclusions which such a convenient systematization might suggest to the mind without warrant.

The doctrine, constitution, worship and devotion of each Church are considered, but also, more important and much more difficult, the *ethos* or characteristic attitude of each. This last is intangible and difficult to assess, yet often the key to an understanding of other Christian religions and of our relationship to them. In the Orthodox Church the central feature is worship; Anglican faith is characterized by its reasonableness and comprehensiveness; for Catholics the Church is the visible kingdom of God on earth and true doctrine is 'what the Church teaches'. What we presume to be an obvious and necessary requirement for any Christian religion, we may find to be peculiar to the Catholic Church.

In this formidable and delicate task Professor Molland attains an objectivity which must be due not only to his acknowledged scholarship but to a sympathetic appreciation of other religious persuasions. Canon Turner's Englishing of the work is admirable, for whilst including the statistics and geographical distribution of the Churches as well as the intricacies of constitutions and potted histories of founders of sects, it is eminently readable throughout, even those pages that are dotted with unnecessary Greek, Latin or German phrases. But to find even the household words of one's own faith mistranslated is irritating and makes one suspicious of the terms in which are presented other denominations with which one is less familiar. This is so much more a pity in that here we have a book which goes a long way to help those who are sincerely interested in ecumenical understanding.

Michael Barrow, S.J.